

JPRS-UPA-89-008
2 FEBRUARY 1989



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

19980127 150

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-89-008

CONTENTS

2 FEBRUARY 1989

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Grossu Addresses Party Secretaries On Perestroika	1
Gorkom, Raykom Secretary Meeting [SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 23 Nov 88]	1
Drokiyev Rayon Secretaries Addressed [SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 20 Nov 88]	2
Department Chief Describes New UkSSR CC Social-Economic Department [L. Brovchenko; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 20 Nov 88]	4

MEDIA, PROPAGANDA

Results of September Moscow Public Opinion Poll on Periodical Acquisition [L. Gudkov; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 22 Sep 88]	7
Government Waste of Printing Paper Allocations Investigated [Ye. Andreyev, V. Maksimov; IZVESTIYA, 25 Sep 88]	9
Illustration in Magazine RODNIK Provokes Negative Reader Reaction	11
Latvian Komsomol CC Buro Condemns Publication [SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH, 1 Nov 88]	11
Readers Indignant Over Publication [B. Aleksenko, I. Dolzhenko, et al.; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 2 Nov 88]	11

CULTURE

Writer Describes Prisoner Labor at Magnitostroy, White-Sea Canal [A.O. Avdeyenko; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 44, 2 Nov 88]	12
Soloukhin Explains Vote Against Pasternak [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 6 Oct 88]	14

SOCIAL ISSUES

UkSSR Voroshilovgrad Obkom Chief on Efforts to End Corruption [G. Yakovlev; PRAVDA, 21 Nov 88]	17
Three-Year Anti-Alcohol Campaign Assessed [L. Miroshnichenko; OGONEK No 39, 24 Sep-1 Oct 88]	19
Moscow Youth Violence Prompts Emergency Meeting [V. Rudnev; MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 29 Oct 88]	24
Mironenko on Viability of Komsomol, Relations With Informals [G. Apresyan; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 43, 26 Oct 88]	25
Komsomol Discussion on Nationality Problems, Passports [N. Natadze, M. Yeligulashvili; MOLODEZH GRUZII, 9 Oct 88]	26
Doctors Sent to Central Asia To Reduce Infant Mortality [A. Likhanov; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 14 Oct 88]	28

REGIONAL ISSUES

Estonia To Switch to 'Zone Time' [F. Kaazik; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 30 Sep 88]	31
BSSR Union of Writers Conducts Popular Front Registration [G. Novikov; SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 6 Nov 88]	31
BSSR CP CC Forms Commission to Rehabilitate Purge Victims [SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 12 Nov 88]	32
LiSSR 17 November Supsov Session Information Report [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 18 Nov 88]	33
LiSSR 18 November Supsov Session Information Report [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 19 Nov 88]	34
Laws on Lithuanian Official Language, Flag, Anthem [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 19 Nov 88]	36
Klikunene Speech on Official Lithuanian Language, Symbols [V. Klikunene; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 19 Nov 88]	37
Draft Ukase on Use of Lithuanian, Other Languages [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 19 Nov 88]	40
Supsov Members Discuss LiSSR Constitution Amendments [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 25 Nov 88]	41
Resolution on Working Group To Draft LiSSR Constitution [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 20 Nov 88]	52

LiSSR Minister of Justice on Constitution Working Group Progress	[SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 21 Nov 88]	
[SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 21 Nov 88]		53
Supsov Deputies Discuss LiSSR Draft Constitution	[SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 27 Nov 88]	56
LiSSR Supsov Secretary's Speech on Draft USSR Constitution Laws		
[SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 20 Nov 88]		63
LiSSR Supsov Resolution on Draft USSR Constitution Laws	[SOVETSKAYA LITVA; 20 Nov 88]	65
LiSSR Supsov Deputies Discuss Draft USSR Constitution Laws	[SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 26 Nov 88]	65

Grossu Addresses Party Secretaries On Perestroika

Gorkom, Raykom Secretary Meeting
18000318 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA
in Russian 23 Nov 88 pp 1, 2

["On the Main Restructuring Avenues"—SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA headline]

[Text] A meeting with party gorkom and raykom first secretaries has been held in the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee.

S. K. Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee who spoke at it, informed those assembled about the results of the meeting in Orel during which urgent questions regarding the present stage in restructuring were examined, especially those concerning party and political support for carrying out the decisions of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference on improving the population's food supply. The progress in implementing the Food Program in the republic was analyzed through the prism of the results of this meeting and M. S. Gorbachev's speech during it.

It was pointed out that some farms and rayons had taken a number of steps to introduce lease, family and individual contracts and that the problems in supplying the population with food were being solved thanks to this. At the same time, attention was directed to the fact that the Food Program in general is still being solved poorly and that the process of changing the orientation toward the new management forms is taking place slowly in the processing industry and other branches of Moldavia's agroindustrial complex.

The party raykoms were charged with carrying out effective measures for the organized conducting of the livestock's wintering and for an increase in the production of livestock products. The CPSU Central Committee letter to communists, farm workers and all agroindustrial complex workers orients them towards this. The holding of a meeting, similar to the one held in Orel, in one of the republic's zones, where definite experience has been accumulated, was recognized as advisable.

A conversation about the study and discussion of the Theses of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee and the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers entitled "Strengthening Restructuring With Concrete Deeds" occurred next. The Central Committee first secretary pointed out that, in submitting a draft of them for frank advice from the people, we are counting on collating our policy with the opinions of the republic's inhabitants. The form itself of the document, which is being submitted for a general discussion in the form of the Theses, assumes additions and modifications. Everyone can express his opinion on

them, enrich them and introduce concrete constructive suggestions that will be taken into consideration during the document's final development.

The Theses have evoked great interest among the people because they analyze self-critically and in a highly principled manner the progress of restructuring in the republic and the activity of party and soviet agencies and public organizations. They examine questions in the social and economic area and spiritual life and problems in inter-nationality relations and language. This is understandable. A growth in national self-awareness and an attempt to understand the nature and level of nationality relations from modern positions is accompanying the restructuring of all aspects of social life. The sharpness of the public's reaction to the deformations accumulated in past years is a characteristic feature of this process in both the republic and the country as a whole.

The subject concerned this during the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. It was pointed out, in particular, that it is necessary to "create all conditions so that national-Russian bilingualism will be developed harmoniously and naturally, considering the distinctive features of each region, and in such a manner that it is free of formalism." Under the republic's conditions, bilingualism permits Moldavians to truly master the Moldavian language; Ukrainians—the Ukrainian; the Gagauz—the Gagauz; the Bulgarians—the Bulgarian; in a word, all nations and nationalities—their native languages. Every nationality also has an opportunity to use the Russian language as the language of international communications.

At the same time, the Theses do not remove from consideration the question of attaching the status of a state language to the Moldavian one. It was also pointed out that the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's interdepartmental commission for studying the history and problems of the Moldavian language is continuing its work in accordance with the work plan. It must thoroughly and comprehensively study the entire range of language problems, including the alphabet.

The meeting pointed out that concrete deeds are more important today than words. Among these is the restructuring aktiv which is the main guarantee for transforming our life. As the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Preparing for the CPSU Central Committee Plenum—On Improving Internationality Relations in the USSR" points out, it is important not to lose the initiative in formulating and solving pressing problems but to overcome the lagging of party organization practical work behind the processes that are occurring in the public consciousness and take a truly vanguard position in the public work of renewal.

The Theses have been submitted for a discussion everywhere—in party, trade union and Komsomol organizations and during meetings in work collectives. In this regard, it is necessary to resolutely get away from formalism and stereotypes and provide everyone, who

wishes it, an opportunity to express his opinion. It is necessary to fill the discussion with the constructive content, spirit and meaning of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference decisions. It is necessary to attach a business-like and specific nature to the discussion of the Theses. One must approach the defining of the forms for its conduct in a differentiated manner. If it is a youth collective, it will probably be better to organize a meeting of the Komsomol organization; where there are few communists—a trade union meeting.

The form can be of any type but the work collective must express its attitude toward the problem being broached. Relying on the strength of persuasion, it is necessary to resolutely oppose any unhealthy statements and attempts to use the expansion of democracy and glasnost for antidemocratic purposes and not allow the discrediting of our general international achievements.

N. F. Bondarchuk, G. I. Yeremey, V. K. Pshenichnikov, A. N. Sangeli, V. F. Semenov, N. A. Tsyu, G. M. Volkov, and V. V. Runkovskiy, Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Buro members and candidate members, and I. F. Feklistov, CPSU Central Committee responsible worker, participated in the meeting's work.

Drokiyev Rayon Secretaries Addressed
18000318 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA
in Russian 20 Nov 88 p 2

[Article entitled: "The Reference Point Is the New"]

[Excerpt] Long before the beginning of the present rayon party conference, not only its delegates but also all rayon communists and workers were able to familiarize themselves with the rayon report's main propositions through the rayon newspaper KOMMUNISTICHESKIY TRUD and participate in a discussion of them. The newspaper also covered meetings with rayon buro members in labor collectives and published lists of candidates for elective bodies, whose business-like qualities were also discussed during party meetings.

The interested discussion of the Theses of the Moldavian Communist Party and Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers entitled "Strengthen Restructuring With Concrete Deeds," which was begun in all collectives, permitted communists and non-party members to size up a great deal for themselves during the preparations for the conference and to define plans for the future concretely, considering the actual situation on the spot. The speaker—G. Belichuk, party rayon first secretary—and delegates—N. Klychkov, a sugar factory worker; P. Georgitsa, a mechanical milking foreman on the Kolkhoz imeni Gorkiy; V. Lukyanchuk, party committee secretary on the Kolkhoz imeni Boris Glavan; M. Gazhiu, chairman of the Patriya Kolkhoz; Ye. Mustyatse, ispolkom chairman of the Drokiyev Village Council of People's Deputies and delegate to the 19th All-Union Party Conference; Yu. Pushkash, secretary of the

party organization in Secondary School No. 4; and others—conducted the discussion in a self-critical, demanding and frank manner.

S. K. Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, spoke to the delegates. He pointed out that bills about amendments and additions to the USSR Constitution and the election of USSR people's deputies are being actively discussed in the republic.

Broad layers of the republic's population heartily support the party policy to renew Soviet society. The Drokiyevskiy Rayon party conference, whose work took place in an atmosphere of unfettered opinions, business-like efficiency, pointed criticism, and an understanding by the communists of their responsibilities for restructuring, reflected the spirit of the times.

The speaker further emphasized that economics has always been the basis for social and political reforms.

S. K. Grossu paid a great deal of attention in his speech to the Theses of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee and Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers entitled "Strengthen Restructuring With Concrete Deeds" that was recently published in the republic's press. Their main goal is to attract the attention of communists and all Moldavian workers to the urgent problems in the republic's social, economic, political and cultural life, which are arising from the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and 19th All-Union Party Conference.

Today, the Theses are a very important reference point for all of the ideological and mass political work of the republic's party organizations during this stage. When organizing the explanation and discussion of them, it is necessary to see to it that everyone is permeated with a sense for the need to consolidate the efforts of the working class, kolkhoz peasants and national intelligentsia in the name of expanding restructuring's social base and involving all layers of the population in it.

Applied to communists, this means achieving an increase in their role and responsibility in labor collectives; strengthening the party's bonds with the masses; consistently following the party's policy of democratization and glasnost; developing and establishing an atmosphere of party comradeship, criticism and self-criticism; and strengthening the struggle against negative phenomena.

The Theses pay serious attention to the realization of the party's strategic policy for shifting to an economy of higher organization and effectiveness. In order to carry out this policy in the republic, every work collective must accelerate its work to raise the scientific and technical level of social production in each branch; carry out the modernization and reconstruction of operating enterprises; rationally use material, financial and labor resources; and

implement in a qualitative manner economic reforms and the universal development of cost accounting, self-financing and lease, contract and cooperative forms for organizing labor.

The solution of such urgent social problems as the food and housing ones, consumer goods production and the ecology, must be at the center of the work in the economic area. Special attention must be paid to the successful conclusion of this year; to the timely fulfillment of the planned targets for the production and sale of all types of products; to the assimilation of capital investments, especially for social and cultural projects; and to the establishment of conditions for an organized entry into the new economic year.

One of the concrete ways to realize these requirements is territorial cost accounting which permits the role and capabilities of local soviets in the shift of the economy to an intensive path of development to be raised. On 1 January of next year, we plan to shift the Drokiyevskiy and Sorokskiy rayons to territorial self-financing and the compiling of local budgets on a norm basis as an experiment. The initial data for developing drafts of local 1989-1990 budgets has already been reported to the rayispolkoms.

This measure is an exceptionally important and critical one. Having closed the circuit of economic relations in the territories' production and social spheres within themselves, the rayon, village and settlement councils will occupy a place proper to them in the state management system. There is no need to mention that it is incumbent on the rayon's party aktiv to participate in the experiment in a very direct manner.

The Theses have allotted a great deal of space to the problem of using intellectual and spiritual potentials in every way possible for the sake of restructuring and to the role of the republic's creative intelligentsia in this very important cause. The spiritual life of the kray, which did not avoid stagnant phenomena, requires further development. It is necessary to reinterpret the achievements of science, public education and culture practically, give them a new impetus, and bring them into conformity with the requirements of restructuring, democracy and glasnost.

The correct formation of the people's public opinion on all matters concerning social, political and spiritual life is a question of high honor for the republic's and rayon's intelligentsia. There is a special need for this. Take such problems as the construction of inter-nationality relations, the participation of the republic in the all-union distribution of labor and the formation of a single national economic complex, the development of the Moldavian language and the expansion of its capabilities in servicing the needs of the kray's population, and the development of bilingualism. It is impossible to examine them one-sidedly—from narrow nationality positions. In order to find correct solutions, it is necessary to rely on historical realities, the centuries-old traditions of the

people and their multifaceted interests and to be guided by such socialist values as internationalism, patriotism, friendship, and the brotherhood of all nations and nationalities in our multinational motherland.

The position of the republic's Central Committee, Supreme Soviet Presidium and government on these problems has been clearly defined and stated in the published Theses.

Serious decisions have been made on developing and studying the Moldavian and Russian languages and the languages of the representatives of other nations and nationalities living in our republic. They are based on Leninist principles: no coercion and no pressure regarding the linguistic attachment and affiliation of each person and each nation. Special attention is being paid to returning to the sources of Moldavian culture. Serious and painstaking work is being performed to eliminate "white spots" in the history of the kray. These spots cannot be explained other than in the context of those negative phenomena of the past which existed throughout the country.

Of course, in solving these questions—just as in solving linguistic policy matters—and in eliminating the deformations in other spiritual areas, it is impossible to manage completely without emotions. This is natural based on the very nature of things. However, one should not yield to emotions and to the strength of the elements. Moreover, one should not involve children and pupils, who still do not have developed and strong ideological positions and who are not able to evaluate on their own the processes that are occurring around us, in the unnecessarily emotional discussions on these subjects.

At the same time, the comments of the people that the special decrees adopted by the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's government are being implemented slowly, are justified. Is it really difficult to achieve the bilingual naming of population points and streets and bilingualism in visual agitation? The workers on the spot, however, do not take notice or do not want to take notice of this. Such an attitude toward this question is simply inadmissible.

Unfortunately, there are people in the republic—just as in several other regions of the country—who operate from nationalistic positions and express premature and unconsidered opinions and actions that can only aggravate the situation and undermine the friendship of USSR peoples. In his speech in Orel, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev clearly expressed his opinion on attempts to artificially aggravate inter-nationality relations matters. He pointed out: "All of us together must reject any attempts to thrust such solutions to existing problems on us—solutions which would go against our internationalist ideology and socialist principles."

The party raykom's important task now is to direct the efforts of the ideological aktiv toward a broad and comprehensive explanation of these questions. The main

thing, however, is to overcome the inertia and conservatism in organizing the implementation of those propositions in the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee decrees which can be solved today.

It is also necessary to organize considerably better the work of studying and discussing the draft laws about changes and additions to the USSR Constitution and about the election of USSR people's deputies.

S. K. Grossu said in conclusion that a very difficult time has begun in the revolutionary process of renewal and restructuring—the shifting of all that had been planned to a concrete plane and the implementation of the party's strategic policy in practice. As is known, this is connected with organizing the enormous popular masses and restructuring thinking in the party, among the people, in each collective, and in each person.

Through the force of the communists' example, conviction and activity, it is necessary to guarantee an acceleration in social and economic development and the successful conclusion of the current economic year and to promote in every way possible the revealing of the potential capabilities of socialism and the further development of democracy.

The Drokiyevskiy Rayon Party Conference adopted a decree directing communists toward such an approach to the task. A new membership of the party raykom and its buro was elected.

**Department Chief Describes New UkSSR CC
Social-Economic Department**
*18110022a Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian 20 Nov 88 p 2*

[Interview, published under the heading "Restructuring of the Party Administrative Apparatus: Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee," with A. P. Savchenko, chief, Social-Economic Department, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, by RADYANSKA UKRAYINA correspondent L. Brovchenko: "Economics Through Man"; first two paragraphs are RADYANSKA UKRAYINA introduction]

[Text] On the basis of the principles formulated at the 19th Party Conference, the October (1988) Plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee determined that it was appropriate to have, among five commissions, a commission to deal with matters of social and economic development. What is the mandate of this commission? How does it differ from the social-economic department? In what areas will the recently-formed social-economic department of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee operate, and what are its functions?

A. P. Savchenko, chief of the social-economic department of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee,

answers these and other questions presented by a RADYANSKA UKRAYINA correspondent.

[Brovchenko] Anatoliy Petrovych, in contrast to the September CPSU Central Committee decree entitled "On Establishment of CPSU Central Committee Commissions and reorganization of the administrative apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee in light of the resolutions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference," which designates a chairman of the commission on matters of social and economic policy, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum decree on establishment of corresponding commissions and reorganization of the administrative apparatus of republic party bodies does not specify a chairman for the commission on matters of social and economic development or for the other four commissions. As is indicated by the editor's mail, this did not go unnoticed by the readers of RADYANSKA UKRAYINA. Therefore on their behalf I would ask you first of all to state exactly what your job and position is in order to bring some clarity to this matter.

[Savchenko] The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum decree you mention deals with establishment of a commission on matters of social and economic development, the membership of which will include members and candidate members of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, workers, engineers, economic managers, Soviet and party workers, and specialists in scientific fields. The social-economic department of the Central Committee administrative apparatus is, so to speak, a working body of this commission, which will conduct the daily work on these matters and will assist the commission members. The commission is to be headed by one of the secretaries of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

[Brovchenko] We would also like to hear about the structure of the new department, the functions it will be performing, and the areas in which it will be operating.

[Savchenko] In forming the new Central Committee administrative structure, the Politburo proceeded from the party conference resolutions on reorienting party committees toward ideological support of development of the economy and political methods of administration and management. Administrative reorganization consists essentially in moving away from the branch principle and reducing staff size. The branch subdivisions of the party Central Committee had a narrow ministerial directional focus. The existing structure tended to scatter the efforts of administrative staff manpower and hindered concentration on study and drafting of recommendations for carrying out important tasks pertaining to the republic's social development, hindered public education effort, fostered technocratic elitism, duplication of effort, and usurpation of the functions of governmental and economic management agencies.

The branch departments guarded ministerial interests. In short, there existed branch differentiation in the face of a common goal.

For this reason the decision was made to organize the social-economic department with the following six sectors: economic methods of management; investment policy and development of productive resources; social development; scientific and technological advance and conservation of resources; health care and social security; ecology. The department will have a staff of 56 employees....

[Brovchenko] And what was the total size of the staff of the nine branch departments?

[Savchenko] Approximately 120. As we see from our structure, in the past the branch departments did not deal directly with a great many matters—for example, matters dealing with ecology or scientific and technological advance, as well as problems of social development as a whole. It is therefore incorrect to say that what we have here is merely the merging of branch departments into a single social-economic department.

All problems with which the department deals have two unifying aspects: reorganization of the political system and democratization of societal affairs, as well as the direct adoption of economic reform. We are firmly convinced that the majority of problems can be resolved by political methods, applying flexible economic incentives. An important function of the department is continuous analysis of the state of affairs and trends in development of public awareness. No realistic policy is possible without such an analysis, without comprehensive observation of the course of the economic process in this republic and the state of affairs in priority areas of the economy.

Take ecology, for example. Formerly there was no such sector within the Central Committee administrative machinery. It was like all departments dealt with problems of ecology, but there was little result. This also was because there was a common goal, but there would be a narrowly-ministerial approach. The plan was paramount, while matters of ecology would be dealt with only when a crisis arose. Now it is necessary to master the principles of environmental protection and interlink production with our people's health. Matters pertaining to intensification of production link to questions of protecting the public health via solution to ecological problems. Here we are in the domain of social problems.

[Brovchenko] Anatoliy Petrovych, that brings up my next question: on the basis of what principles is the department being staffed? Judging by what you have told us, the area covered by even a single sector is extremely diversified, multilevel, and multibranch.

[Savchenko] It is our firm conviction that comrades with experience in ideological work and who are highly-professional specialists in diversified sectors and branches of the economy should work in this department, for without specialized knowledge and experience it will be difficult for an administrative staff member to grasp complex problems of economic theory and practice, sociology, the applied sciences, etc, thoroughly to analyze and assess the development prospects of a given domain of human activity. The ability to convey economic ideas to the masses and persuasively to communicate the correctness of one's assertions is important for any party worker. For example, medical specialists, specialists in metallurgy, chemistry, and in other branches will be working in the same sector. In order to devise an intelligent strategy in matters of ecology it is necessary to examine a problem and evaluate it comprehensively, going far beyond the framework of a given branch.

I should like to add that in reorganizing the departments we did not give any preference to those employees whose job or position was being retained. In selecting personnel for a department, we considered first and foremost an individual's capabilities for achievement, his knowledgeability within the given area, experience in party work, and purposefulness in carrying out the tasks of perestroika.

As the doctors say, man's health is also improved by infusion of new blood. We therefore plan on bringing in new people to comprise 30 percent of the department's staff, that is, to bring in specialists from the economy as well as scientists.

[Brovchenko] Speaking of scientists, there exists the opinion that people judge the intellectual level of a group by the presence of people with academic degrees. I personally do not unequivocally hold such a view, but nevertheless: are there any doctors and candidates of sciences in the department?

[Savchenko] Yes. But I should state that we shall be engaging for the most active participation in the practical work of formulating commission policy on matters of social and economic development that scientific potential which has already been established in this republic. Members and candidate members of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and world-renowned scientists—B. Ye. Paton, I. I. Lukinov, K. M. Sytnyk and others—will be working actively on the commission. Therefore, to answer your question, a rather high intellectual level has been ensured.

[Brovchenko] You will agree, however, that no matter how knowledgeable department staff personnel and commission members may be, without modern equipment and computers it will be difficult to make a thorough analysis of the republic's socioeconomic development and comprehensively to evaluate the political

and social consequences of decisions, to make recommendations and to specify ways to accomplish the most rapid progress.

[Savchenko] You are quite right. Therefore this question is the most critical one on the agenda. By the end of the year the department will be equipped with several personal computers, and by the end of the five-year plan the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee will have its own data processing and computer center, which will be linked to the data processing and computer systems of Gosplan, Goskomstat, and a number of other republic agencies. Incidentally, our people's personal computers will also have access to these data banks. In the meantime we shall be making use of the large data processing and computer systems of republic agencies and organizations.

[Brovchenko] In discussing the operation of this department, we should probably not forget that one of its main tasks is selection, education, and placement of cadres in our economy, particularly during the period of economic reform. I should like to discuss this matter in greater detail.

[Savchenko] They say that economic accountability is exact knowledge of an operation and its end results. And one of the reasons why economic accountability is not being adopted as rapidly as we would hope is ignorance of and failure to adhere to its basic points by enterprise management and administrative officials of structural subdivisions. In this area we should not issue commands but instruct people. For this reason we shall constantly be working with those cadres who will be directly implementing the economic reform. Who will know the economic specialists better than us? Therefore our department will implement personnel policy in the economy on a priority basis together with the department of organizational-party and personnel matters as well as other Central Committee departments.

[Brovchenko] The structure and functions of the administrative apparatus of the party oblast committees will change in connection with change in the functions and reorganization of the administrative apparatus of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. Weighed down by the burden of their own stereotypes, some local party officials are somewhat disconcerted: they do not know how to proceed if there is a reorganization but there are no detailed recommendations, which as a rule were given in the past. It is a matter of the

composition, designation, and functions of the new departments. What advice do you have for them?

[Savchenko] I do not think that the pernicious habit of waiting for instructions from the higher echelon will lead to any good. There is no point in expecting some kind of ready recipes. Party workers in the localities must themselves look for the most acceptable problem solutions, for structural reorganization and elimination of inappropriate functions is not an end in itself. The main thing is to take into consideration the demands of the 19th All-Union Party Conference, the July and September (1988) CPSU Central Committee plenums and, of course, the interests of the oblast in organizational and ideological support of the oblast's development. Judging from the small amount of practical experience amassed to date by the republic party organization, party oblast committee social-economic departments are being formed, proceeding from the following areas of activity: new economic methods of economic management; scientific and technological advance and conservation of resources; social development; comprehensive development of an area's productive resources on the basis of a long-term government program; ecology; development of external economic relations; etc. But I repeat: other variations of department organizational structure are also possible, depending on the specific oblast and specific region.

An oblast committee's social-economic department should first and foremost study and work on problems of coordinated development of the oblast's economic branches, directed toward improving living standards. And, most important, efforts should be concentrated on organizational and educational work with party members in administrative and management positions and with the political nucleus of the workforce—primary party organizations.

This cannot be accomplished in just one day or in just one month, but it is essential once and for all that provision of required machinery parts, movement of railcars for loading and unloading, and a great many other economic matters be dealt with by those within whose jobs these matters fall, not by party agencies.

Quite frankly, structural reorganization of the Central Committee's branch departments has brought forth a good many complex problems. We have found answers to most of them, but we are still looking for answers to some of them. "Breaking in" the new party administrative mechanism is a complicated process which demands a thoughtful approach, patience, tireless search and inquiry, and adoption of bold decisions.

Results of September Moscow Public Opinion Poll on Periodical Acquisition

18300076 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian 22 Sep 88 p 6

[Article by L. Gudkov, candidate of philosophical sciences, senior research assistant at the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion on Socio-Economic Issues: "What the Circulation Figures Say"]

[Text] A subscription campaign is underway in the country which has elicited the most contradictory discussion and views. The recently created All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion on Socio-Economic Issues, under the direction of Academician T. Zaslavskaya, has decided to expound these in one of its first studies. The importance of such polls dealing with various problems of social life today needs not be proved. They are necessary in order to make correct management decisions.

Here we publish certain conclusions of the poll, which was conducted in September in Moscow.

The selection of Moscow is related to the fact that the events and processes of restructuring in our country are manifest there earlier than anywhere else, and there show the greatest contrasts. Although the data obtained are still not in their final, definitive form (they will be specified more precisely and supplemented), results of the poll testify to the great tenseness of the situation.

Growth in the circulation of newspapers and magazines over the past three years has proceeded uninterrupted. There has been an especially sharp rise in individual subscriptions, a convincing indicator as to how the population relates to the press. This growth, however, was entirely uneven on the whole. Of all the periodical publications published, we will address those characterized by special reader recognition and support: six or seven central "thick" literary-social magazines, practically all youth publications and periodicals, a small number of "thin" mass publications of a family nature (RABOTNITSA, KRESTYANKA, ZDOROVYE, ZA RULEM), and several central newspapers as well—LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, IZVESTIYA, UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA, TRUD, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, and others. Most all of the departmental and party publications, oblast newspapers, peripheral literary-arts and social magazines, as well as specific branch publications, have at best maintained their readership with difficulty over these years. Differentiation of publications has been facilitated by the free nature of subscriptioning last year, the opportunity for the reader to select "his own" magazine or newspaper, and the removal to a great extent of "supports" and artificial "stimuli" (in the form of mandatory subscriptions to a number of political publications).

The poll was conducted from a sampling selection modeling the professional, age and educational characteristics of the Moscow population and reflected the views and ideas of the most diverse groups.

By the middle of September, practically all Moscow citizens had done everything in their power to subscribe to desired publications for the next year. However, only one percent (!) succeeded in obtaining everything they wanted without difficulties. Lack of information and frequent breakdowns at the post office and work place caused a wave of annoyance and lack of confidence. Almost one out of every six individuals polled had encountered poor organization of subscriptions at the post office or unfair distribution of quotas at the work place. A substantial number of Moscow citizens were thus unable to receive all the publications they were interested in, either at the post office (64.5 percent) or at the work place (85.8 percent), although they were assured that three-fourths of the stock supply was delivered to the labor collectives.

The sharply negative attitude towards the very fact of introducing quotas is therefore understandable—they are seen not only as a customary shortage, but as a denial of the right to information as well. The overwhelming majority (84.2 percent) looks at the introduction of quotas as an unacceptable measure. Plans by the Main Administration for Publications Distribution and State Publishing Committee to increase retail at the expense of subscriptions met with sharp disapproval from most Moscow citizens (69.6 percent), primarily due to a lack of trust (almost half of our respondents believe this will not be done).

Right now the only form of reaction to the conflicts which have arisen is the use of more severe administrative methods in management and distribution. As a result, even those publications for which the demand was completely satisfied in the past are joining the ranks of those in short supply and difficult to acquire. This year subscription difficulties have affected practically all publications (five percent were even unable one way or another to subscribe to PRAVDA). But the degree of restrictiveness has been exceedingly inequitable. As before, there is a shortage of those popular mass publications there have always been restrictions with (49 percent of those desiring RABOTNITSA were unable to subscribe; for KRESTYANKA, ZDOROVYE and ZA RULEM the figures are 40, 33 and 61 percent, respectively; 25.5 percent were unable to obtain KOMSOMOLKA; 30 percent—MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS, and 37 percent—TRUD). Maximum dissatisfaction, however, is related not to these publications, but to a relatively small number of magazines and newspapers which are coming into the forefront of the public interest. On their pages are posed the most serious questions concerning the public and socio-economic life of the country. They give historical and social diagnoses of the state of society and provide significant assistance to the party in its restructuring efforts.

And it is these publications which are being hurt by the introduction of quotas. Subjecting these prominent publications to quotas, even within the 1988 circulation figures, means a violent suspension in their readership growth which, over the past two years has increased from 30 to 400 percent. In spite of promises to maintain former subscription volume, this has decreased for the majority of popular publications from two to five percent. Thus, while 262,900 copies of NOVYY MIR were circulated in Moscow in 1988, only 251,000 copies will be issued next year. For DRUZHBA NARODOV these figures are 126,200 and 121,700, respectively; OGO-NEK—147,000 and 129,600, etc. (Only the circulation figures of MOSKVA and AVRORA actually increased.) The quota system affected subscribers of many years as well as new subscribers. 73.1 percent of individuals desiring to subscribe to OGONEK could not; ZNAMYA—61.7 percent; NOVYY MIR—55.2 percent; DRUZHBA NARODOV—51 percent. The same thing was true with respect to several newspapers and weekly publications—only 48.8 percent of those desiring subscription to LITURNAYA GAZETA were successful; 49 percent for ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, etc.

The situation is not as critical for the magazines MOLODAYA GVARDIYA and NASH SOVREMENNİK. The demand for these is many times lower (5-20 times) than, let us say, for NOVYY MIR or DRUZHBA NARODOV. In 1988 in Moscow, for example, only 1.5 - 2 percent of MOLODAYA GVARDIYA printed copies were sold out (whereas this amounted to 23 percent for NOVYY MIR).

The most frequently encountered "bundle" in the responses forms a nucleus of popular publications—LITURNAYA GAZETA, NOVYY MIR, OGONEK, DRUZHBA NARODOV and ZNAMYA, encompassing a readership circle of a somewhat trained portion of the public. This shows that the readership of these publications comprises one and the same social environment, the same groups of people. As a rule, these people subscribe to several newspapers and magazines and the scope of their informational needs is diversified. They are authoritative, innovative people who formulate the social reputation of writers and publishers, the initial readers and connoisseurs of published materials. Therefore, readers of the "thick" and "thin" journals have differing appraisals of the reasons and motives behind the introduction of quotas. In general, the selection itself and the number of publications subscribed to are extremely significant—behind them lie level of education, including professional education, and degree of social activity. The higher the level of qualification, as a rule, the greater the degree of involvement in events taking place within the country and the greater the need for intellectual information.

Readers of mass publications (the "thin" magazines and newspapers) subscribe to relatively few—three or four on the average—while readers of the "thick" publications receive an average of seven or eight. They are inclined to

a much greater degree to espouse a departmental position with conviction; they are more amenable and, generally speaking, prepared to be satisfied with the way things are. Subscription quotas have affected them significantly less. They often refuse to answer questions out of a fear that this will cause them some trouble ("next you will be reporting about my attitude towards work").

Readers of the "thick" magazines—LITURNAYA GAZETA and OGONEK—on the other hand, are vitally interested in the development of democratization and glasnost. They feel a great responsibility for the course of events in the country and are, on the whole, more critical and more competent in their judgments. They are therefore less often satisfied with the standard explanations given by departmental managers for introducing quotas—inadequate paper supply and backward printing equipment. They see in subscription quotas not only the lethargy and inability of the State Publishing Committee and Main Administration for Publications Distribution to satisfy the growing demand of the population for periodicals, but open and overbearing imposition. Readers of "thick" magazines are nine times more likely to associate the introduction of quotas with political and social factors—not only with pressure by anti-restructuring forces on the press (a factor 26 percent of respondents pointed to), but also with weakness, the limited nature of reforms being carried out, and inadequate guarantees of the glasnost policy in the country (18.3 percent).

Readers of "thick" and "thin" magazines are almost united in their appraisal of the inability of the existing publications system to act with flexibility and effect redistribution of capacities and resources. But subscribers to "thin" publications and certain newspapers go no further than the overall desire "to stop publishing unnecessary literature." "Thick" magazine subscribers, on the other hand, are critical in evaluating the ability of publishing houses to effect transition to self-support management under the opportunities which are presently available, without affording them complete independence in the sphere of publication policy (only eight percent pointed to this as an effective means of solving the publications problems). These subscribers more often proposed active and immediate measures: "to purchase the necessary paper abroad," "to print the most popular publications abroad," etc.

The subscription campaign has not yet ended. The situation has changed just so slightly under the influence of criticism in the press and letters written by readers—a certain quantity of paper has been allocated for KOMSOMOLKA, TRUD and certain other publications. We are involved with subscriptions every year. Attempts at "rationed distribution" of publications, as our research shows, not only lead to increased shortages, but elicit an irritation in people which is understandable. We therefore hope that this year's disorder and confusion provide lessons which will be learned.

Government Waste of Printing Paper Allocations Investigated

18300076b Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
25 Sep 88 p 2

[Article by Ye. Andreyev and V. Maksimov: "Thousands of Tons of Instructions (Or How Departments Squander Paper in Short Supply)"]

[Text] Here was the scene one of us witnessed last Saturday at Moscow's 172d Communications Section. Brandishing receipts, the potential subscriber, a lady, was almost screaming:

"What right do you have not to accept my subscription?"

In a quiet, tired voice, the older woman was trying to explain: "Look, the list is in front of you..."

And in fact, affixed with cord to the counter was a thick piece of paper with the names of several dozen newspapers and magazines. Above and to the side of the list was a sign reading "No Subscriptions" in boldface.

"But why?"—the subscriber asked, not giving up.

"They say there's no paper," the woman shrugged.

No paper... Fighting off a public outraged by the sharp drop in unconfined subscriptions for 1989, the directors of the USSR Communications Ministry also publicly cited the lack of paper as the chief reason behind the decision to "freeze" circulation and establish restrictions in the selection of newspapers and magazines according to subscriber choice. Furious readers wrote letters to editors demanding that decisive measures be taken, one of which included a proposed reduction in book publishing.

Might today's subscription problems actually be due to the book publishers? We decided to visit the USSR State Publishing Commission.

"Nothing of the sort," retorted S. Galkin, chief of the Main Administration for Material/Technical Supply and Sales. "Our plan for next year, unfortunately, remains at this year's level. The State Publishing Committee and central publishing houses subordinate to it require only 16.7 percent of the printing paper produced in the country. And if you add in the publishing houses of the union republics, you will find a total of 51 percent being expended for books and magazines."

And what about the other 49 percent?

"Partially in the publishing facilities of the party, Komsomol and trade union systems and in that of the Academy of Sciences," Galkin replied, "but chiefly in the ministries and departments. There is where you will find it."

We chose a ministry at random from the directory—the Machine Tools Industry Ministry. Meeting with Yu.

Tsarev, deputy director of the Main Administration for Material/Technical Supply, we asked:

"What quantity of printing paper did the branch receive during the current year?"

"Just short of 700 tons."

"And how is it spent?"

"In a careful manner," Tsarev explains confidently. "We allot more than half for publishing intra-departmental material—information booklets, various reference manuals. We send the remainder directly to the enterprises..."

We will not take it upon ourselves to judge whether or not such a great need for ministry publications is justified. Based on the facts, we can only say that it is in no way obligatory to produce such output on the printing paper which is in short supply. As experts confirm, it would be entirely possible—with no detriment to document content—to manage using technical-specification paper. This is the first point. Secondly, when we took a little effort to look at documents coming in and out, and when we examined the requisitions of all enterprises without exception, we discovered a most universal indifference to paper—that which is referred to artfully as "the bread of culture."

So we are saying that over three tons of printing paper, entirely suitable for the publication of children's books, was sent by the Machine Tools Industry Ministry to Krasnodar, to a local metalwork assembly tools plant. And what was it used for? For... wrapping up finished products—wrenches and reverse screwdrivers. And a ton and a half of art paper in extremely short supply, necessary for the publication of colorful, highly artistic albums, was put to use as labels and instruction sheets for cutting knives—so that we, naive people that we are, might know how to use this kitchen instrument.

It might seem a minor point to the uninformed individual that Machine Tools Industry Ministry plants sent in their requisitions to branch headquarters without even taking the time to indicate unit of measurement—whether they needed paper in tons, or in units, or in sheets. But the experts know that such an approach shows that no one in the branch feels a paper shortage.

When we expressed our unrestrained astonishment at this to department chief A. Gordeyev, he replied simply: "Well you know for our plants paper is a tertiary product."

His answer was undisguised and, in any case, justifies our assumption that with sensible use, with the ministry applying strict guidelines and supervision, there is no telling how much less paper they would be able to get along with, compared with what they receive today.

"What do you mean?" objected V. Papanov, first deputy minister of the machine-tools manufacturing industry. "As a minimum we need 1200 tons of printing paper—twice as much as we receive today."

These are the kinds of appetites you see.

Unfortunately, they are as exceedingly great in other industrial branches as well. With an energy worthy of imitation they knock on every door at Gosplan trying to assert and confirm their requisitions. And many are entirely successful at it. But when the printing paper is received, they forget about it completely in the ministries and no one monitors its sensible use. Let us say that the Ministry of Agricultural Machines and Implements has been allocated 1138 tons of printing paper this year. This quantity of paper would be sufficient to publish 221,000 annual subscriptions to NOVYY MIR. How is it used? For the manufacture of so-called product-accompanying documentation—instructions and manuals on equipment use, advertisements, catalogs, labels... And these documents contain page after page of regurgitated elementary facts and design descriptions often necessary to no one.

But it is a curious fact that, even in view of such outrageous institutional wastefulness, they still do not manage to expend all the allotted paper. Thus, last year the Ministry of Agricultural Machines and Implements was able to use just 79.9 percent of its allocated typographic paper, and in the first half of this year—45 percent of its annual supplies, which increase from year to year.

How do the ministries come by such a free and easy life? The explanation is quite simple: paper is allocated to the departments according to their aggregate cost of production. Insofar as these prices are crawling continuously upwards, even a reduction of production volume measured "in items" will still result in increased paper allocations. Add in a couple of little tricks such as setting too high the index of mass for one square meter of paper in the requisitions, the lack of justification for using amalgamated expenditure standards in calculations, and setting transitional residue levels too low, and you will get an ideal opportunity for squandering printing paper right and left. Many departments are delighted to use diplomas, certificates, membership cards, receipts, labels, etc., and place orders for them in large quantities.

"But really," they may object, "people need these various kinds of certificates and labels..."

All right. But let us return to S. Galkin's office.

"At our enterprises we have leftover waste remnants that we could make duly presentable and use instead of full-fledged printing paper," Galkin states. "It is especially offensive when they use first-quality art and offset paper in critically short supply for printing up the simplest product-accompanying documentation. Not too long ago book publishing in the 'First Model Typography' association fell off due to a lack of art paper. I found some in a warehouse belonging to Gossnab's Moscow

City Paper Sales Center—about 14 tons. 'In God's name,' I asked the manager, 'give me the paper. I promise to provide a substitution.' He would not agree to do it. Only the intervention of the Gossnab deputy chairman was able to help."

Unfortunately, many ministries and departments receive high-quality printing paper which either means absolutely nothing to them, or is unnecessary in such great quantities. According to experts, replacing these types of paper with a lower grade in Gosstroy's Central Institute of Standard Design alone would free up about 500 tons for newspaper publishing!

A sharp cut in departmental publications could provide an important means of economizing with respect to paper. Insofar as these are distributed along departmental channels, however, it would be practically impossible to establish the actual demand for them.

"And what is Gosplan looking at?" asks one irate reader.

Gosplan Deputy Chairman A. Lukashov replied sincerely that Gosplan is "looking at the base," in other words, at the quantities which were allocated last year to the ministries and departments. If a new requisition is increased one or two percent, they fulfill it without asking questions. It is true that Gosplan departmental requisitions for paper "make cuts," and sometimes rather significantly. Last year they removed 10,000 tons from assets. But, according to experts' calculations, at least another 30,000 tons could be cut from the ministries' assets planned for next year without any problem.

"What would the State Publishing Committee do if all of a sudden it received this 30,000 tons as a gift?" we jokingly asked D. Mamleyev, first deputy chairman of the committee.

"That would be enough to publish one million copies of the 'Book of Health,' encyclopedic dictionaries for children, multi-volume works of Klyuchevskiy and Solov'yev, of Bulgakov and Pasternak..."

Alas, we still do not have a real manager for our paper, a strict and thrifty manager. Perhaps the USSR State Publishing Committee could become it? What can be said in favor of such a proposal? Since last year the State Publishing Committee has become the coordinator for publication of all books and magazines in the country. The experience it has accumulated and methods it has developed would facilitate competent decision-making with regard to distributing paper among the departments—depending, of course, on the nature and technology of the printing and publishing processes. Losses could be sharply reduced by utilizing waste materials effectively. And variations of cooperative and specialized effort in the publishing sphere economically advantageous to the departments would certainly appear, along with a unified approach to product-accompanying and other documentation. But most importantly... most importantly, is the fact that the readers would win—all

of us, including those who today are being refused subscriptions with the comment: "I'm sorry, we have a paper problem in the country."

Illustration in Magazine RODNIK Provokes Negative Reader Reaction

Latvian Komsomol CC Buro Condemns Publication

18000221 Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH in Russian 1 Nov 88 p 4

[Article by Central Committee Buro of the Latvian Komsomol: "In the Central Committee of the Leninist Communist Youth League of Latvia"]

[Text] A drawing by Uris Utans, which the editorial staff intended to use as an illustration in L. Dobychin's novel "The City Ehn", was published in the tenth issue of the magazine RODNIK. This is also corroborated by the fact that another illustration appeared in the tenth issue of the magazine AVOTS, where M. Bulgakov's novel "A Dog's Heart" is being published.

The Central Committee Buro of the Leninist Communist Youth League of Latvia (LKSM), having thoroughly familiarized itself with the illustration, as well as with the readers' comments concerning it, has come to the conclusion that the aforementioned illustration is in poor taste and lends itself to ambiguous interpretation. In the first place an insufficient knowledge of its audience and an inability to predict a possible negative reaction, and secondly, the mood of the illustration and its lack of any connection with the text of the magazine have led to a misunderstanding.

At the same time it also should be taken into account that the issue was prepared for press three months ago and was released at a time when the political situation in the republic had worsened.

The Central Committee Buro of the Latvian Komsomol has obliged Ayvar Klyavis, the chief editor of the magazine AVOTS (RODNIK) and all those who are working in the Komsomol press and on the editorial staffs of youth television and radio programs to think seriously not only about the content of the materials, but also about their visual effect as well as about the possible political consequences.

The Central Committee Buro of the Latvian Komsomol condemns attempts to use this illustration for arousing unhealthy passions.

Central Committee Buro of the Latvian Komsomol.

Readers Indignant Over Publication

18000221 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 2 Nov 88 p 3

[Article by Communists B. Aleksenko, I. Dolzhenko, R. Kerayshis, A. Kobtsev, N. Kokhreidze, I. Skayya, M. Uglanov, and 68 more signatories under the rubric "Response": "We Are Outraged"]

[Text] We cannot remain indifferent to Uris Utans's drawing in the magazine RODNIK issue number 10 for 1988—a publication which is printed by the Central Committee of the Latvian Komsomol. How could its editorial staff allow such a blasphemous portrayal of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin—whose name the Komsomol bears?!

Every citizen of our country, who reveres the name of the founder of the first socialist state in the world, should consider a publication of this type as a personal insult.

Today, when revolutionary reforms are taking place in the USSR, we are returning to the great legacy of V.I. Lenin. But how should one interpret this treatment?! Glasnost, democracy, and open discussion of this or that problem still does not mean that the time has come when everything is permitted.

In the resolution adopted by the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference "On Glasnost", it states that "glasnost presupposes social, legal, and moral responsibility on the part of the mass media. Lofty ideological and moral content, competence, and strict observance of professional ethics should be indispensable requirements in this sphere..."

We feel that the appraisal, which was given by the Secretariat and Central Committee Buro of the Latvian Komsomol to the editorial staff of the magazine RODNIK, was not based on principle. Can it be stated that Yu. Utans's drawing represents material which possesses an alternative ideological interpretation?! No, it is a blatant profanation of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin's image.

Today there is little to write other than such publications are intolerable, that it is necessary to give every communist a party appraisal which is based on principle, and that some through their own actions have assaulted the memory of V.I. Lenin.

Communists B. Aleksenko,
I. Dolzhenko, R. Kerayshis,
A. Kobtsev, N. Kokhreidze,
Eh. Skayya, M. Uglanov, and
68 more signatories

**Writer Describes Prisoner Labor at Magnitostroy,
White-Sea Canal**

18000295 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in
Russian No 44, 2 Nov 88 p 7

[Interview with Aleksandr Ostapovich Avdeyenko, writer, by A. Zotikov: "A Knot of Time: Interview Across a Worktable"; date and place not given; first paragraph is introductory]

[Text] The 1930's.... It would, most likely, be difficult to name another period in the history of the Soviet state at which we have been looking more intently nowadays. It is here that opinions clash and disputes seethe which are characterized least of all by academic dispassionateness. And, in listening to the general chorus, we try particularly hard to distinguish within it the voices of those who were direct participants in the events of that period. Whatever the case may be, their words are especially valuable. And here is one more piece of testimony, one more voice from the past.... The list of prose which the journal ZNAMYA will present to its readers during the coming year opens with a new work by A. Avdeyenko. Today we are visiting one of the oldest Soviet prose writers (he recently celebrated his 80th birthday), the author of novels, short stories, plays, and film scenarios.

[Zotikov] Aleksandr Ostapovich, I'd like to begin our conversation about the book which will be presented for the readers' judgement with a question that touches upon your past as a writer. The novel "I Love" brought you a noisy success during the early 1930's and instantly confirmed you, a recent steam-locomotive engineer from Magnitka, in your vocation as a writer. Its topic is the birth of a worker's individual personality and the achievements of building socialism; the place of its action is Magnitostroy. New times arrive; opinions and literary tastes change. How do you yourself now evaluate your own first serious literary work, written half a century ago?

[Avdeyenko] Let me begin my answer from quite a ways back. In both books—the fictional one of 1933 and the documentary one of 1988—the chief protagonist is the Times. The times of the 1930's were two-faced—a time of greatness, which inspired people to labor and heroic deeds, and an onerous, terrible time. And it was these times which also molded me, a worker at the great Magnitka, which called me to a literary circle and then into literature itself; it was they which inspired me to create the novel entitled "I Love." My first book was essentially a declaration of love for our transformed country, for the Soviet regime, and for the party. At that time there were millions like me—enthusiasts, romantics, unselfish builders of the new life. But during these same 1930's millions of people existed in a completely different time, under other circumstances. The authorities uncovered "wreckers" [saboteurs], condemned them in trials, sentenced them, threw them into prison, or drove them into exile. The consequences of forced collectivization began to manifest themselves. Hunger

raged, and here and there whole villages died out. The cities were packed with indigent people from the rural areas. A working person, like myself, for example, used to obtain 800 or sometimes even 1000 grams of bread with his ration card. But my mama, who lived in a village, did not used to obtain even 100 grams. The village authorities took from her the last husked corn, which she had hidden in a milk-jug. And this was done by the people from her own village. They were already such good "detectives" that they figured out that they should look in milk-jugs. Plundered and separated from their land, people died, including those in the Ukraine, which had always been a breadbasket, which had always kept some reserves in its granaries for a "rainy day." Matters even got to the point of cannibalism! It was under such onerous conditions that Magnitka was built. As one of its labor veterans, I can bear witness to this. It was built not only by hardened, "pure" workers. There was an enormous number of "deviationists," for example, in 1929. There were artels of ditchdiggers, excavators, stone-masons, and carpenters. They had their own horses, carts, and tools, as well as the habits of persons who are their own bosses. And then those persons who had been forced to flee from forced collectivization began to appear. I don't cover up the sins of myself and my comrades, who were, perhaps, excessively "revolutionary" kids [young fellows]: we had a scornful attitude toward these rural refugees. And to no purpose. It was unjust. They were fleeing, as it has now been ascertained, from the criminal and arbitrary treatment which raged in the villages. And so we must not look at the events of those times with eyes covered by blinders. We must instead comprehend them in the light of the present-day glasnost.

That's true. But my feelings at that time are also true. Without any exaggeration I can say that, before I arrived at Magnitka, I considered myself a nobody. And when I started to work on a steam locomotive, when I began to turn out record smeltings together with the blast-furnace operators, when I became a shockworker, and concluded a socialist-emulation agreement, then I gained a sense of pride, self-respect, and human dignity. And it was then that I wrote "I Love"—a book which contained quite a bit of delight in our achievements and bitter truth about our troubles. It was written with my heart's blood.

[Zotikov] It's probably high time that we began talking about your new book, which will be published in the journal ZNAMYA.

[Avdeyenko] But we have already been talking about it for some time now. It has chapters devoted to Magnitostroy. This was the time of my youth, the time when all the "knots" were being tied in politics, economics, and culture—the knots of Stalinism, which have not been completely untied even nowadays. I was a delegate at the Congress of Soviets in the Kremlin which summed up the results of the First Five-Year Plan. I, a rank-and-file worker, took part in a great matter of state.... It was something to be proud of. Something to talk about. For

example, about the fact that, in my own speech at this congress, I extolled Stalin to the skies. I spoke sincerely, from the heart. Molotov even mentioned me in his concluding speech. He said something like the following: "I must dwell a bit on the speech made by the writer Avdeyenko, who expressed the entire nation's love for the great Stalin."

[Zotikov] What year was that?

[Avdoyenko] The beginning of February 1935. As you can see, I too had a hand in creating the Cult of Stalin. Nor was I alone. The entire congress, 2500 persons, stupefied by the radio, newspapers, agitators, and thunderous speeches—all of us believed that Stalin was expressing the will of the party and the will of the people. Even the political opponents of Stalin's orders, shortly before their own deaths, extolled the "socialism" built by Stalin as well as Stalin himself. But this great deception would never have succeeded if there had not been a popular movement for true socialism, a popular striving toward that life which was being propagandized every day from morning till night. Everything took place in magnificent "stage-sets." It is impossible not to take all this beauty, as well as the pompous, grandiose quality of the slogans into consideration. There was a substitution of appearances for genuine economic achievements. But this substitution was very carefully concealed. The "enemies of the people" were sent to prison, exile, and even shot in rigid secrecy. Such cases were announced only when it was impossible to keep things quiet—as in the cases of Zinovyev, Kamenev, Bukharin, and Rykov. But, of course, millions of persons disappeared without a trace. That's the way it was: on the one hand—criminal secrecy, and, on the other hand—the ceremonial features of an event and magnificent slogans. They gave us slogans to eat and drink; slogans replaced the natural laws of life. The so-called "Stalin Constitution" guaranteed human rights and liberties, which in fact were violated. It was considered to be the best in the world, whereas, in fact, it was such...only on paper. There were also other "stage-sets."

[Zotikov] You mean, the White-Sea-Baltic Canal, for example...?

[Avdeyenko] This canal ruined an enormous amount of splendid lands. The "capital" of the Dissenters [Old Believers]—Vyetsiya—was in the canal's right-of-way. We wild fellows considered the Dissenters to be the country's most reactionary people. But they had a high level of agriculture, compared to the average Russian level. Their per capital literacy was also higher—and this at a time of a nationwide struggle against illiteracy. They had a culture, a morality, a very high respect for each other, and a human brotherhood. And here the canal went straight through the heart of this Vyetsiya, which was located very close to the water on the banks of the Vyg River. The best lands and the best villages were wiped from the face of the Earth. Who did this. Stalinism. Stalin himself. With his blue pencil he drew a

straight line on the map. And hundreds of thousands of insulted and injured cons [prisoners] built the canal along this "staright line." Who were these people? For the most part, they were peasants who had been freed from serfdom. There were also future academicians and writers, scholars, burglars, and pickpockets. But you can't compel a burglar to work; he's not accustomed to it and doesn't know how. But a peasant knows how—and so the peasant became the basis of the work force. I too was at this canal, when it had its ceremonial opening. Upon Stalin's orders, the Chekists organized a writers' expedition. They gave us a special train consisting of cars with upholstered seats. Each compartment had a case loaded with wine, dried sausages, caviar, and chocolate. Three seats were occupied by writers, while the fourth was occupied by such a case. The Organizing Committee (the Writers' Union did not yet exist) assembled a brigade consisting of 120 persons. For the most part, they were those who were "well in hand"—Kulik, Yanko Kupalo, Vsevolod Ivanov, Bezymenskiy, the Kukryniksy, Vera Inber, Bruno Yasenskiy, Valentin Katayev. I have described this noisy, festive, amazing trip in detail. Upon our return to Moscow, we were immediately sent out to another canal—imeni Moscow, which had just gotten underway. The writers then published a huge volume about the White-Sea construction project: "The Canal imeni Stalin."

And the Kolyma was already being secretly built at this time. It was a secret construction project. And the entire future camp-type establishment was conceived and underwent a check-out at the construction site of the White-Sea-Baltic Canal. And so here is another example of the "secret-open" parallel. I visited the Canal imeni Moscow yet another time—in 1935. On a certain occasion Mekhlis, the editor of PRAVDA, called me into his office and said that he and Gorkiy had decided that I was the most suitable candidate to become the chronicler of this canal's construction. Right then and there Mekhlis telephone Yagoda and a meeting with the latter was agreed upon. And so there I was in Yagoda's office. At the end of our conversation he asked: "Alright, in what capacity do you want to work at the canal?" I said: "Certainly not as a con." "Well, O.K.," he said. "we'll dress you up in a Cheka uniform." They put two, diamond-shaped insignia on my lapels (Yagoda himself had four of them). Under this cover I gathered material at the canal for several months. But, as they say, things did not work out. I was like a white crow there. There was no real contact with either of the main groups. The real Chekists saw that I understood nothing about their work. And when I wanted to chat with the prisoners, they were afraid of my diamond-shaped insignia. Furthermore, I failed to ask the questions the way I should have.

[Zotikov] You mean, the "way you should have" from the prisoners' standpoint?

[Avdeyenko] Of course. I was young and naive. For me the cons were just people like everyone else. I'd ask them: "What are you in for?" And this would throw them into

a dreadful confusion. No Chekist would have put such a question to a member of the "Canal Army." The proper way to ask was: "According to what article were you convicted?"

[Zotikov] So did you get any replies at all from your "What for" question?

[Avdeyenko] They used to answer me as follows: "Well, Citizen Chief, I myself really don't know what I'm serving this sentence for. They said that I'm a wrecker, a saboteur of grain procurements, or that I caused a plague among the cattle. That's what they said, and then they wrote out my sentence. And I believed what these people said. In the end, my trustfulness led me astray too. Once, in passing by a sports court, I started to admire how well some young fellows were playing volleyball. At that time I was an inveterate volleyball player. I was so tempted by the game that I unbuckled my strap with its holster, set it down next to a post, and played for about 15 minutes. It turned out that I was playing with some young cons. I was immediately summoned by the chief of the entire camp establishment, who said the following to me good-naturedly: "Why did you act like some kind of spring chicken? Those cons could have grabbed your pistol and shot you and the guard." I candidly confessed that, indeed, they could have done that. I was simple-minded and not the stuff of which camp chiefs are made. The matter finished with Yagoda ordering his people to see to it that I was kept "far away from the canal." They chased me away ignominiously. And I've talked about this in my new book. I've also talked about the terrible judgement to which I was subjected by Stalin and his intrepid retinue: Zhdanov, Malenkov, and Andreyev. Indeed, my new book is almost all about Stalin and Stalinism in its various manifestations. During that period everybody experienced Stalinism on his own hide to one degree or another. As you can see, they did not shoot me or even put me into prison. They summoned me to the Large House on Old Square, and, in the presence of the Central Committee's ideological officials and the members of the Writers' Union Board—Fadееv, Katayev, Pogodin, Aseyev, Trenev, and others—Stalin conducted the inquest, the trial, and the scaffold. During this five-hour session he spoke about 10 times. On the next day a notice appeared in PRAVDA. It stated something like this: "In view of the fact that the works of the writer Avdeyenko, as they have appeared recently, have been anti-Soviet in their nature, his correspondent's card is hereby taken away from him." For me, a communist, not yet expelled from the party, and still a member of the Writers' union, this inadmissible treatment was witnessed by millions of readers. And, prior to this, also in PRAVDA, an item entitled "A Spurious Film" had appeared. The scenario of this film (it was entitled "The Law of Life") had been written by me. And this motion picture had enjoyed a good press; its box-office take was more than the foreign film called "The Great Waltz" (so I was later told by those in the film industry). But Stalin, after he had seen "The Law of Life," called it anti-Soviet. And he even wrote a review of it, which was printed unsigned, as

something from the editorial staff. This decided the fate of the film and myself. Stalin's opinion outweighed the viewers' favorable reaction, the commercial success, and the judgement of the professional critics. After the monstrous judgement by Stalin there were judgements by "lower courts." This "anti-Soviet" writer was expelled from the party, from the Writers' union, and thrown out of his apartment literally onto the street. The story of this most painful event in my life takes up a good half of the book. That's just about all I wanted to say. Maybe it's more, maybe it's less than you need—I don't know. It's difficult for any author to speak absolutely objectively about his own creation. It always seems to him that he has expressed the most important thing, but, alas, he's often mistaken.

[Zotikov] Aleksandr Ostapovich, just what is, after all, the genre of your book—memoirs, documentary prose, or a novel?

[Avdeyenko] Instead of replying to your question, let me quote what one of the classics said about writers' work: "...It seems to me that after some time they will not create works but merely talk about what they have happened to observe in life that is significant and interesting."

Soloukhin Explains Vote Against Pasternak
18000042 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 6 Oct 88 p 5

[Article by V. Soloukhin under the rubric of "Letter to the Editor": "It is Time to Explain"]

[Text] Approximately three or so times (and that is enough) I have been reminded at literary meetings at home and abroad that I am on the "black list" and that this is forever, for all coming generations, that this is a stigma which cannot be removed.

Here is the "black list."

Sergey Sergeyevich Smirnov held a meeting as the head of the Moscow Writers Organization. L. Oshanin, K. Zelinskiy, Valeriya Gerasimova, V.O. Pertsov, A. Bezymenskiy, A. Sofronov, Boris Slutskiy, Galina Nikolayeva, Vl. Soloukhin, S. Baruzdin, Leonid Martynov, Boris Polevoy.

The fourteen people who spoke at that meeting. Various people have now cited this list in their memoirs, and it is invariably accompanied by such phrases as "We remember by name those who raised their hands," and "This will never be erased..." Everywhere on the planet these people are branded as the tormenters and as virtually the murderers of the "greatest genius of the 20th century," B. Pasternak.

Here the reader "SK" brands me because I now read aloud Pasternak's verses, and in so doing I display obvious dishonor by failing to recall my own past deed.

If one could only listen to everyone who now cannot recall what he said 30 (or even fewer) years ago! Even the reader "SK" probably said something at her own meetings without using, for example, the little word "stagnation."

For many reasons I myself rarely turn on the television, but I am told that recently A. Voznesenskiy said on television that Soloukhin was burning "to confess" this deed. He repeated this assertion on the pages of NEDELYA, issue No 3 for 1988.

I will surprise you when I say that I have never experienced a burning desire to confess and "come clean" not because I was already very clever and good when I spoke then but because I do not feel that I have committed any particular sin. I shall return to this at the end of these comments.

It is true that several times at literary meetings I have said something to the effect that now I would not speak at such a meeting, and not out of fear (after the fact) of turning up on the black list but because my attitude has changed, and not so much toward Pasternak, as toward meetings of that kind. But that is now; let us recall how it was then. And first of all, let us name that time, for the times, as everyone knows, are changing. In the middle ages people were burned at the stake for supposed contact with an unclean force, but in the 20th century, an unclean force was elevated to the rank of the greatest virtue and progress. Art based on evil, violence, the breakdown of morality, spiritual devastation and anti-humanism was encouraged in every possible way and washed over the entire world in its own poisonous wave. Instead of fires there was another extreme: "Oscars," "Golden Records," "Golden Goddesses," "Golden Harps," "Golden Guitars," all kinds of prizes to be won at numerous international competitions and festivals, honorary titles and as a result—millions.

And so, let us name the time. The year was 1958.

In 1958 it was considered criminal for Soviet writers to send manuscripts abroad. It is good to say this now, when A. Bitov's novel "Pushinskiy dom" (Pushkin's House), which was published "over there" a long time ago (by Ardis Publishing House, USA), is being reprinted by NOVYY MIR, when A. Bek's novel "Novoye Naznacheniye" (New Appointment), which was also published "over there," is being reprinted by the magazine ZNAMYA, and when Dombrovskiy's novel "Fakultet Nenuzhnykh veshchey" (Faculty of Unnecessary Things), published "over there," is being printed by NOVYY MIR... But then... Then, as we recall, two literary figures (Sinyavskiy and Daniel), were sentenced not by a civil but a criminal court for sending manuscripts out and were given long sentences. This, of course, was monstrous, but those were the times.

And then B. Pasternak submitted his novel "Doktor Zhivago" (Doctor Zhivago) to an Italian publisher.

People should not think that concerned Moscow writers spontaneously gathered in a large hall and independently arranged a meeting to work their colleague over. Let us call a spade a spade; after all, we have glasnost now. The then-head of the state and party (and with us it is the party which is the ruling force), embarrassed by Pasternak's deed, (and here it was still necessary to introduce to our shores the democratization of society, a process which was about to begin boiling up), pounded his fist on the table in an arbitrary and voluntaristic manner, and gave the Union of Writers strict instructions... And there was a meeting. There was S.S. Smirnov, respected by many readers and writers, chairing this meeting. And there were the 14 people who spoke, meaning the ones who are now on the "black list," who will never lose the stigma, who want to "confess," etc.

In the spirit of that time the speeches were different.

I recall, for example, the main line from Slutskiy's speech: "A writer must look for recognition among his own people." It was said (although this, too, smacks of a vulgar sociology) that the main events of the epoch had passed Pasternak's poetry by, or more accurately, that Pasternak's poetry had passed us by. Well, there was... collectivization, the first five-year plans, the war... It was said that when Pasternak was writing (beautiful, it is true) poetry about the candle burning on the table... and two shoes falling with a thud to the floor, other poets at this time were writing "Zhdi menya" (Wait for Me), "Ya ubit podo Rzhnevom" (I was killed at Rzhnev), and "Vragi sozhgli rodnuyu khatu" (The enemies burned our cottage). It was said that Pasternak isolated himself from the people, who were building a bright communist society...

Of course, all this is nonsense. You do not exclude a poet from the Union of Writers because he did not write "Ya ubit podo Rzhnevom" and "Vasiliya Terkina" (Vasiliy Terkin). Pasternak was not excluded for creative independence but because he submitted his manuscript abroad. That was the nature of the times.

I do not know what kind of considerations guided those who spoke, for some it was youth, for others stupidity or cowardice, but in my opinion, no one was guided by any additional considerations; it was, in fact, simply in the spirit of the time: they proposed—you acted. It is necessary to understand as well that there still existed the idea of party discipline. For example, Boris Slutskiy. He was not young, he was not stupid, and he was not a coward; he had been through the war. Then what? Maybe they went through 500 people and all but 14 refused to speak? ... But I think that the first ones who were asked agreed, and here I want to exaggerate the situation, which, speaking personally, has made me take up the pen.

Let us agree that all of us, the 14 people, were cowards, time servers, sychophants, betrayers, scum, that we truly "cannot be cleansed of this." But my good people, there were no fewer than 500 people in the hall where the

meeting took place. Those sitting there probably included those who today say that "we cannot be cleansed," who even then considered Pasternak a genius of the 20th century.

And so, I ask, where were they? Why were they all, to the last man and woman, silent? Why was there not a sound, not a whisper? Why did no one cry out, why did no one reply, why did no one utter even the smallest word in defense of the poet?

Well, take Voznesenskiy; he only became a member of the Communist Party two years later. But Yevtushenko had already been a member of the union for six years. Bokov was there (I name here Pasternak's most passionate admirers); Pasternak's peers and friends were there. Antokolskiy, Inber, Selvinskiy, Kirsanov, Aliger, Kataev, Anatoliy Rybakov, Shatrov, A. Bek, Trifonov, Tendryakov, Paustovskiy, Baklanov, Yelizar Maltsev, Viktor Shklovskiy, Marshak, Tikhonov, Shchipachev, Narovchatov, Lukonin, Svetlov, Mezhirov—they were all there. Everyone had to be. There was no valid reason for absence.

I will cite from Veniamin Kaverin ("Literator" [A Man of Letters], the magazine ZNAMYA, No 8, 1987, p 116). "I did not go to this meeting. I said I was ill, and my wife had two harsh conversations with the organizing secretary Voronkov, who twice called and demanded that I come. As I did more than once, I "bravely" hid. Now, when I think of this, I am ashamed. I should have gone and voted against..."

If they said to me (now) that they would exclude my peers and friends from the Communist Party, for example, Astafyev, Alekseyev, Belov, Rasputnik, or that same Andrey, I would use my last bit of strength to crawl on my hands and knees, clutching a table knife in my teeth, to such a meeting! But if a person truly could not go, he could at least send a written protest to the secretariat to the USSR Communist Party later. There was not one. So why do they bandy about only our 14 names?

With the help of the mass media Ye. Yevtushenko recently described his own behavior that day. He, it turns out, was then secretary of the Komsomol organization of the USSR Union of Writers. And as the Komsomol leader they asked him to speak, but he refused. Ye. Yevtushenko considers this deed to have been almost

heroic. But if he had the courage to keep silent, then why did he not have the courage to speak out in defense of Pasternak? He did not want to give up his duties as Komsomol organizer?

The moral problem of whether it is better (or rather worse) to speak or keep silent was decided by mankind a long time ago. A. Voznesenskiy, as always, writes with talent: "If you do not speak today, amends cannot be made tomorrow... Memory is eternal... They silenced themselves, everyone was waiting for the weather..."

But the weather seems to have changed. And from every house top on the planet the word is being shouted: genius, genius! But why was this little word not heard once in 1958 in this room? Out of several hundred people why did no one rush to the podium on the stage or simply jump up from his seat and shout "What are you doing? Come to your senses! This is a genius." No, there was silence. I think that if V. Kaverin had come to the meeting at Voronkov's demand, he would hardly have spoken out against a background of 500-700 silent people. There were probably that many brave people in the hall, but there was silence. Horrors! Five hundred cowardly writers? Horrors! Then what? And why the silence?

But, as everyone knows, the crucifixion of Christ is linked in mankind's consciousness not so much with the name of Caiaphas, the chief priest of the Jews, who insisted on the death penalty, as with the name of Pontius Pilate, who kept silent and washed his hands of it.

It is now time to give the promised explanation of the word which I used at the beginning of this piece, when I said that I do not feel that I have committed any particular sin, and consequently do not have a burning desire to "cleanse myself" or "confess." I consider that I who who rose and spoke am no more a "sinner" than the others who sat in the hall and kept silent. No, my dear good friends, if there is to be cleansing and confessing, let us all do it together, all of us who were in that room and in general those who were considered to be Soviet writers at that time. We need to cleanse ourselves not of the deed (for non-commission of a deed is also a deed), but of that time. It is time that we understood this.

It is true that "a word is not a sparrow..." i.e., a spoken word takes its flight. But it is also true that "If you do not speak today, amends cannot be made tomorrow. Memory is eternal!"

UkSSR Voroshilovgrad Obkom Chief on Efforts to End Corruption

18000215 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Nov 88 p 3

[Article by G. Yakovlev, "PRAVDA" special correspondent, under the rubric "From the Policies of the 19th Party Conference": Without a Right to Shout"]

[Text] *Frankly speaking, B. Goncharenko, the former First Secretary of the Voroshilovgrad Party Obkom left a difficult legacy behind him. It was openly noted in response to the "PRAVDA" article, "Stepping Over the Final Line" (4 Jan 1987), that "effective steps for the decisive elimination of stagnant phenomena in the economy and social sphere are not being taken by the Party obkom and gorkoms." The readers have not forgotten this pointed article and have asked the editorial staff the following questions: how is the normalization of the situation among the Voroshilovgradites proceeding and has the oblast Party organization, which previously had so many fine traditions to its credit, managed to regain its former prestige? "PRAVDA's" mail also brought up the subject of an interview with I. Lyakhovyy, the First Secretary of the Voroshilovgrad Party Obkom.*

[Yakovlev] Ivan Andreyevich, the already mentioned response to our editorial staff regarding the article "Stepping Over the Final Line" also referred to the fact that an environment of mutual exactingness and elevated responsibility and fraternal trust has not been created in the buro and secretariat of the Obkom. It is natural that these traits are also spread vertically into the primary Party organizations. It is not easy to regain the trust of communists.

[Lyakhovyy] Nevertheless, it is precisely toward this purpose which our organizational and political work among the masses are directed today. We will not be able to influence the development of the economy and social sphere without the confidence of the communists and all the workers. We are striving for a situation in all Party committees where the strong-arm methods will give way to political methods and the cabinet form of government will give way to a broad dialogue with the people.

That is why we frequently discuss Party discipline. Unfortunately, many people have different notions of party discipline. I am personally against mechanical assiduity. The passivity and unwillingness to assume responsibility, which were characteristic during the years of stagnation were concealed behind mechanical assiduity. It was much easier to play the role of a "cog". But the cause suffers from such a "policy" and an unhealthy moral environment is created. We want people to stand up tall, take a critical look around themselves, and to speak outright about the sore points and about that which is bothering them.

Let's say there is an exchange of opinions occurring at the obkom buro meeting. What used to happen at times? The first secretary did not lead the buro meeting, but

ruled over it, and he always reserved the final word for himself on any issue. But why? Are there instructions to this effect? Of course not. Furthermore, rudeness, ignoring the opinions of others, and an anything goes attitude are intolerable. Criticism is a good remedy for this.

[Yakovlev] And have you already been criticized in the oblast?

[Lyakhovyy] Of course. Even before the 19th All-Union Party Conference, when the delegates were being elected, Aleksandr Pavlovich Makartsov, a drift miner from Krasnodon, demanded that I give the leaders and the rank and file communists a more objective appraisal of both the successes and faults. I agree with his opinion.

[Yakovlev] He evidently had someone specific in mind?

[Lyakhovyy] Yes, he named R. Zverev, the former chairman of the oblast ispolkom, who was severely reprimanded by the Central Committee of the CPU and an entry was made in his party registration form. There were serious mistakes in his work and he displayed personal indiscretion. And the buro did not put him in his place in a timely manner.

[Yakovlev] It is no secret that many Party and other oblast leaders were, as they say, too energetic in arranging for their own personal well-being. People lost confidence in these Party leaders. But while preparing for this conversation, I learned that the bureau has decided to transfer 13 million rubles, which were allocated for the construction of a new Party obkom building, to the construction of a sports-entertainment complex. And that you, personally, after returning to the oblast, refused to occupy the former first secretary's apartment, and took up residence in your old, small apartment.

[Lyakhovyy] I do not see a topic for a special discussion in these facts. The obkom staff has been reduced by one third and we decided that we could get by nicely without a new building. By the way, 30 obkom telephone numbers have been given to disabled war veterans. On the whole, I feel that one must always remember Lenin's statement: do not judge a person according to what he thinks or says about himself, but according to his actions.

[Yakovlev] Once again we have come to the topic of trust. A need to search for ideals and trust in the authority of those, who are leading in the name of the Party, is resident in mankind. Do Party workers always remember that their destiny is to serve as an example in all things?

[Lyakhovyy] If I speak honestly, I must say not always and not everyone. For example, V. Poltavtsev proved to be a casual person in the post of First Secretary of the Melovskiy Raykom. He rose to the position of "the first" too rapidly and he did not have time to mature politically. The words "I", Poltavtsev began to be heard with

increasing volume and obtrusiveness for each slightest success of the rayon laborers. His arrogance grew. He refused a four-room apartment and demanded a detached house for himself. He evaded the waiting period for buying an automobile.

[Yakovlev] And did the communists remain silent?

[Lyakhovyy] They did not remain silent, but they criticized timidly and resorted more to exhortations. It had no effect on him. Then the raykom plenum investigated the personal affairs of its first secretary. And at this point the matter boiled over. He was relieved of his position, severely reprimanded, and an entry was made in his Party registration form. There were also suggestions to expel him from the Party.

The Slavyanoserbkiy raykom remained beyond criticism for a long time. First Secretary V. Chepurnoy has been the top man there for 14 years and has come to believe in his right to command. Self-assurance has turned into uncontrolled willfulness. For example, the secretary of the "Donetskiy" state farm Party committee criticized the raykom for omissions. The persecutions began. He, the agronomist, went away to work as a driver. On more than one occasion his wife was summoned without cause by the militia. I think that timely intervention by the obkom comrades and the rayon Party active would have kept V. Chepurnoy from making mistakes. But by the time they stepped in it was obviously too late. It was needed earlier.

I cite these examples with a heavy heart. We have to pay dearly for mistakes in selecting personnel—with the prestige of the Party worker.

[Yakovlev] Should one think that many shortcomings in the personnel policy extend to the present day because of that "final line", which "Pravda" wrote about?

[Lyakhovyy] We are trying to arouse social activeness in people and a sense of personal responsibility for the fate of all matters in the city, rayon, and oblast. During the years of stagnation, it was considered the norm not to object, let's say, to the department manager, not to mention, to the Party secretary. This practice was allegedly justified by Party discipline. But Party discipline is something else, it is submission to the majority and not to the person who has a chair which is a little taller. You have seen how anyone can be removed from their position. The principle "to be at the heart of the masses" became the standard phrase for reports. It is no coincidence that since the first weeks of my work in the Voroshilovgrad oblast, Party veterans have approached me and sharply raised the issue of separating the Party apparatus from the labor collectives. The issue was stated point-blank: Party leaders should organize the masses for the performance of tasks which are common to the whole people, and not rule over them by using the apparatus.

[Yakovlev] I read material concerning N Dyma, the first secretary of the Stakhanovsk Party gorkom. In my opinion, his search and difficulties were candidly discussed.

[Lyakhovyy] The cases, which I have cited, can be considered as an exception to the rule. And there are also Party workers, such as Nikolay Fedorovich Dyma, who define the personality of the oblast Party organization. Incidentally, the material concerning him was published at the initiative of the newspaper and not the obkom. Questions have arisen, which are bothering many communists,—about the character and lifestyle of the gorkom secretary. Nikolay Fedorovich is from a working family and since childhood, respect for both his work and the work of others was implanted in him. He began his life story as a metal worker in a mine and he completed the Mining Institute by correspondence.

He lives in an old apartment with a living space of 38 square meters. He lived there even when there were five people in his family. Nikolay Fedorovich's rate of salary is 350 rubles and his wife, a former operator at an ore-dressing plant, receives a pension of 132 rubles. You will not see her in an official vehicle but more frequently in line at the counter. Nikolay Fedorovich lives openly, he is not averse to material comforts, but about work, his "work-day" averages 12-14 hours. A day off is a rarity. This, of course, is a disorder, but we will emulate him for the time being.

There are no special stores or distributors whatsoever there in the gorkom. For many years the first secretary has not even used vouchers to the health center, but has rested in his own garden plot. Recently, he made his first personal request—to help him purchase a used car through the commission shop. He did not have enough savings for a new one.

[Yakovlev] Ivan Andreyevich, I was told that at your first meetings with the Party obkom apparatus, the oblast ispolkom, and the law enforcement agencies, you requested that they remember the honor of communists. As I remember, you spoke out against using one's official position for personal goals.

[Lyakhovyy] Naturally, such discussions arose during the meetings. The indulgences, which existed, for all practical purposes have been eliminated. Now the obkom is building dwellings in ordinary buildings on a shares basis. Eight of our workers received an authorization to an apartment in a building on the outskirts of the city—a new housing area is being built there and for the present many public conveniences are lacking. Recently we had to set straight a distinguished mining team-leader. He wanted to exchange his apartment as it is for another spacious apartment which was equipped with all the modern conveniences. The indiscretion was suppressed and the authorization was given to a large family. We had to have a talk about modesty with several managers, including obkom workers, who, in the first

place, had built small houses for themselves in the gardening cooperatives, had hooked up to the water main, and had equipped the lots with modern conveniences.

[Yakovlev] In a word, is the locomotive of perestroika gathering speed?

[Lyakhovyy] It is on the move anyway. Major socioeconomic problems have been outlined and solving them will raise the level of public and consumer services, medical care, and of the supply of goods to the residents of cities and villages.

[Yakovlev] So what do you consider the issue of the day...

[Lyakhovyy] Changing the work style in all the oblast Party organizations, molding the character of our personnel, and reorienting their way of thinking and behavior patterns. In short, to win the confidence of the masses and with their help, accelerate the processes of perestroika. For the benefit of the people.

Interview conducted by
G. Yakovlev.
("PRAVDA" Special Correspondent).
Voroshilovgrad.

Three-Year Anti-Alcohol Campaign Assessed
18300060 Moscow OGONEK in Russian
No 39, 24 Sep-1 Oct 88 pp 20-23

[Article by Lev Miroshnichenko: "How Much Does Sobriety Cost?"]

[Text] It is probably about time to calculate how much the first 3 years of the routine and most intensive siege of the fortress over which, vexing though it may be, the banner of an old enemy, the "green serpent," flies as before. Yet, it seems, all available means of battle have been set in motion.

Some initial successes gave hope. Drunken absenteeism was reduced and there were fewer industrial injuries. The country's population purchased and drank 14.7 billion liters of all possible kinds of alcoholic beverages in 1984. Thanks to decisive steps, the flow of strong drink sold was reduced to 8.2 billion liters in 1987.

Seemingly, we ought to rejoice and continue to smother the enemy in this manner further.

Unfortunately, it is becoming increasingly obvious that the successes achieved over 3 years are modest, to put it mildly. Yet, to make up for it, all sorts of unpleasant new problems are appearing and intensifying.

Despite doubling vodka prices, the Treasury has fallen short by 37 billion rubles over the last 3 years as a result of reducing the sale of alcohol. Monetary losses can be endured for a good cause, but have we really become somewhat more sober?

Alas, judging by everything, today we drink just about as much as we did in 1985. The figures dispassionately attest to the fact that the sale of vodka has fallen from 2.5 to 1.2 billion liters in the last 2 years. However, the sale of sugar jumped by 1.5 billion kilograms in the same time period. This, according to the estimate of experienced Ministry of Internal Affairs experts on home-distilling, more than makes up for the decrease in state-sold alcohol. Incidentally, it would be appropriate to note that the volume of sugar sales in 1985 was even lower than it was in 1980. We no longer remember a time when there were stoppages in the supply of this profitable agricultural product. Now, many cities have converted to a rationing system for selling sugar to the public, as if there were a war. Immediately, difficulties with caramel, candies, juices, preserves, etc., can be expected.

Yet, there really is a war, an embittered and obstinate one. The antagonist is suffering great damage, but for some reason his ranks are not drying up. In 1985, 80,000 moonshine makers were caught and punished; in 1986—150,000; and in 1987—397,000. How many were not caught? In the first 5 months of this year, 270,000 moonshine makers had already been caught. However, 2.7 million people overall had been held liable for all kinds of alcohol-related transgressions, which the Ministry of Internal Affairs reports as though it were a great achievement. Except, somehow, such achievements do not cause one to rejoice.

The punishments are severe, right up to imprisonment with confiscation of property, but nonetheless the number of people taking this risk is growing, not reducing. The militia is training dogs to find moonshine by smell and conducting extensive raids on homes and apartments, at times resembling a round-up, on the verge of violating constitutional rights to the inviolability of one's home. Such thorough searches were recently conducted in villages in Kursk, Tomsk and Kharkov oblasts, and homemade beer and moonshine were found in every third or fourth home.

The distillers resort to all kinds of tricks and subterfuges. They hide raw vodka in attics, sheds and haystacks and they bury it in kitchen gardens and even in manure heaps. Moonshine makers also excel in inventing distilling devices, which may even be constructed from a milking machine and, sometimes, even using a computer. In evading the militia's obsessive pursuit, home-distilling is relocating to the work place, to shops and studios, becoming a unique form of "brigade contract."

The price attests to the high demand for moonshine: up to 70 rubles for a 3-liter bottle, i.e., more expensive than store-sold vodka. Indeed, one can understand why it is more expensive, even though it is also more toxic. Just try to go and buy some, cursing. If one is set on having something, so to speak, one would not spare one's last pair of pants. So, they spare nothing, paying speculators 10-15 rubles more per bottle.

A militia detail of ten people patrols every vodka center in Petrozavodsk. However, even this battle detachment turned out to be inadequate. On New Year's Eve, a crowd of 5,000 braved all barriers, removed a truck and, in concert, broke down the door to the store. In this regard, unfortunately, an old woman, who had courageously attempted to procure refreshments for relatives expected as guests, was crushed to death against the door-jamb.

The army of alcohol speculators is growing: salesclerks, taxi drivers, train conductors, groundskeepers and public bathroom cleaners are involved in speculation. While the militia rushes around among the alcohol profiteers, moonshine makers and the vodka lines, it is unsuccessfully directing its attention to apartment burglars, so apartment robberies are increasing. A well-organized alcohol mafia is maturing in the depths of society.

Drunkards have resorted to colognes, hair-growing lotions and tonics, all kinds of lacquers, glues and polishes, and mixtures for washing windows, for rubbing on an aching back, and for sore throats. The population has begun suffering great inconvenience due to the disappearance of simple, inexpensive alcoholic liquids, needed for everyday life and health, from stores and pharmacies. Nurses are being inconvenienced because there is no longer anything to wipe on a patient's buttock before an injection.

However, there is another great price—human lives. A wave of poisonings with alcoholic substitutes, often fatal, has occurred, sometimes involving entire groups at home and at work. A quite recent example: in a Ukrainian village, the school director entertained the sovkhos mechanic after furniture had been delivered to the school. The mechanic died in the morning, and 2 days later the director also parted with his life. The very same ill-fated substitute figured in the director's funeral banquet, and eight people had been poisoned by daybreak, right after the luckless director and mechanic, including the mechanic's daughter and two sons.

Last year, 11,000 people fell prey to similar tragic mistakes—almost as many of our people died in the war in Afghanistan.

Addiction to drugs and toxic substances has increased, particularly among young people.

There was hope that restricted access to alcohol would have a beneficial influence on the upbringing of the teen-age generation. Alas, a recent collegium meeting of the USSR Prosecutor's Office noted that crime among teen-agers has grown and that there are a half-million teen-agers on the MVD inspectorate books for cases involving minors.

Something was ill thought-out at the start of this crusade. Surveys of the population indicate that, despite everything, as before no less than 80 percent of adults consume alcohol, and the number of teetotalers has not

grown by as many supporters as campaign enthusiasts had hoped for. Yet, restructuring must be carried out not only by the non-drinking 20 percent, far from all of whom are moral people, but also by the remaining drinking 80 percent.

Indeed, relations with the green serpent which formed in the early 1980s are alarming. In the course of 20 years, the volume of alcoholic beverages consumed in the country has grown persistently. In 1980, 8.7 liters of alcohol per capita were consumed in the country (expressed in terms of 100 percent alcohol), or more than that consumed in 1960 by a factor of 2.5. The growth in all possible consequences of excessive alcohol consumption and the increase in the numbers of those who consume it most excessively is disturbing. People began drinking openly and taking the hair of the dog at work in the morning. Drunken injuries and other alcohol-related problems have increased. However, with some thought, it was obvious even then that the increase in these problems was not related simply to the presence of alcohol in stores, but to certain profound causes. They fought the consequences, but it was unacceptable to discuss the causes at that time.

Now, one can talk about them frankly and openly. For example, the statement by publicist Nikolay Shmelev: "The main cause of increasing drunkenness in the 1960s-1980s lies in the fact that people are tired of lies and incoherence, of the fact that there is nothing for them to apply their hands and heads to."

All the same, all the same... we continue to solve the alcoholism problem using methods which would have been more appropriate to the "stagnant" 1960s-1970s and are in no way in keeping with the spirit and style of the revolutionary transformations now taking place in other areas of our life. Most likely, instead of starting up this campaign, aimed not at the causes which encourage excessive drunkenness, but at drinkers and alcohol itself, it would have been appropriate to first ask all kinds of difficult questions and try to answer them. For example, the following:

Why is it possible in Brazil at any time of day or night to buy a bucket or even a cistern of alcohol, made from sugar cane for refueling cars, cheaper than gasoline in terms of price, but the parks and streets are not littered with dead-drunk citizens?

How come, for many decades running, fewer alcoholics (per capita) have been found in Georgia or Armenia, where the mountain slopes are thick with grape vines and every peasant cellar always has at least two bottles of wine, than in Russia by a factor of 7-10? How come Tbilisi and Yerevan have no "sobering up" stations?

In Japan, seemingly careful and rational in all relations, why were 170,000 automatic machines for selling alcoholic beverages, capable of intoxicating the entire adult

population to senselessness in 24 hours, recently installed throughout the country?

Why has the per capita consumption of alcohol fallen of its own accord in most developed countries in the last 5-6 years? In Italy and France the reduction began even earlier, without any compulsion or force whatsoever. Wine has remained on sale, accessible without restriction and inexpensive, and most Italians and Frenchmen have not noticed that they had begun to consume less over the years. Statistics confirm: from 1970 to 1986, the per capita alcohol consumption annually declined by 3.7 liters in France, and by 5 liters in Italy.

Why must we foist our "healthy way of life" on people, and why has it become frightening for many?

The situation here in May 1985 allowed us to consider all the confused problems with more substantiation and less haste. Alcohol consumption peaked in 1980, did not grow in the future, and even, as in Western countries, displayed a trend towards some decline. The growth in alcoholism ceased. Unfortunately, a hasty desire to finish with the problem in one mighty administrative blow gained the upper hand.

There was hope that a large body of the population could be successfully involved in the anti-alcohol movement via a volunteer sobriety society, which was rapidly created. However, a grandiose, essentially useless, typically bureaucratic structure resulted, into which "volunteer" members had to be coerced. It is worth considering this creation in more detail.

It is neither more nor less than 450,000 primary organizations, scattered throughout the country, from hot Kushka to frozen Franz Josef Land. Of course, the primary organizations are subordinate and regularly report to "higher" rayon and city organizations, of which there are more than 3,000. These, in turn, receive instructions from the next level of anti-alcohol power—oblast, kray and republic.

Yet in heaven, i.e., in the capital, the "Society Central Council," which has its own chairman, deputies, responsible secretary, board members and a large staff, works with solemnity in an attractive building with columns. Overall, 6,500 staff associates work in the "society," on account of the 15 million ruble-paying rank-and-file members. Yet, the state still adds a sizable subsidy. Moreover, at the different levels the 164,000 "society council" members regularly meet, confirm and approve, receiving, of course, a wage from their basic work place on these days.

In general, it is no surprise that this gigantic organization with its elaborate hierarchical structure has turned out to be so ineffective, if not harmful. Regardless of the anti-alcohol noise and fuss that it disseminates, it in fact works for itself. It does not worry or trouble anyone that at least one-third of the society consists of drinkers, that

cell chairmen often end up in "sobering-up" stations, and that audiences for plant anti-alcohol lectures are practically herded in with a stick.

There may be people in this society who truly want to do good work and to help the unfortunate. Obviously, however, they do not affect the situation. There is no spirit of true charity in this society. The typical tone of public and press speeches by activists is that of appeals to screw the anti-alcohol nuts tighter and to bring pressure to bear more strictly against drinkers. In TREZVOST I KULTURA, one of the "society" leaders recently expressed dissatisfaction with the fact that it is forbidden to burst into homes and apartments without the prosecutor's permission when searching for alcohol heretics, and that "society" members were not given the right to fine drunkards.

Not finding supporters among the mass of ordinary "sinners," the sobriety society activists have done well in finding a common language with many representatives of local administrations who, out of the kindness of their hearts, have not given up the campaign style of work. Hence, for example, the numerous escapades with declaring villages and rayons sobriety zones, which have fallen through with quiet disgrace.

Hence the sham alcohol-free weddings—with a militia man at the door and vodka in the samovars. Hence the passion, incomprehensible to a sober mind, with which the local authorities razed hundreds of thousands of hectares of excellent vineyards from the face of the earth in a brief period of time in the Crimea, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Moldavia, when only 4 kilograms of grapes are consumed per capita annually in the country.

The summer before last, I dropped by a laboratory to see a friend of mine, a virtuoso analyst, at work. To my surprise, I saw on the table near the expensive, computer-equipped chromatography machine, not the usual test tubes with the regular blood samples from patients, but an array of differently colored bottles and jars with kefir, yogurt, juices and all kinds of other beverages.

"What is this, have you decided to hold two jobs at once by opening up a food store?"

"Hardly. You see, this is a state assignment: find alcohol in all of this."

"Well, did you find much?"

"A lot or a little, but this devils' elixir was discovered almost everywhere: for example, there are 5-6 grams per liter in juices, 8-10 grams in kefir, and 12-15 in kvas. So, instead of 30 grams of vodka you could peacefully pick up a liter of kvas."

This assignment arose unexpectedly in connection with an entirely senseless battle which extremists from the society for sobriety had waged with great ardor against

kefir, bombarding Minzdrav, the Council of Ministers and the CPSU Central Committee with petitions for its ban in the course of 2 years.

The new-found enemies of kefir tried to convince people that for many years the criminal "alcohol-programming of children," beginning at the nursing age, i.e., chronic alcohol poisoning and preparation for future alcoholism, was being committed with kefir's help in the country.

What would these orthodox fighters against kefir say if, in analyzing their blood, as much alcohol was found as exists after a glass of dry wine? They may swear that they did not swallow even a drop. It has been known for some time that people who do not drink at all have alcohol in their blood, the level of which fluctuates in a broad range which, possibly, has important vital significance. Should this information be kept secret from the general public, before it is too late? After all, from a formal viewpoint it turns out that there is not a single absolutely sober person!

This example shows what kind of absurdity, far from harmless, can be reached when a problem is exaggerated.

Apparently, one of the fundamental errors of the latest anti-alcohol campaign, as well as of all the preceding ones, was to combine two problems: use and abuse. Alcohol abuse is use which becomes a purpose in itself, when everything goes awry at work and at home because of drunkenness, when people continue to drink, regardless of the fact that an enlarged liver is falling out from under a strap and little green devils are appearing.

The rest of the cases are just use. As everyone knows, Pushkin, Turgenev, Blok and many other outstanding people, unfamiliar with contemporary anti-alcohol literature, "used" alcohol.

In the large developed countries, special institutes have been created for the struggle against alcohol abuse and sociologists, physicians and psychologists are conducting meaningful studies. Drunken drivers are strictly punished. However, not one of these countries fights against alcohol use. On the contrary, they try to create conditions as pleasant as possible for the use of this poison. There is an entertainment district in Tokyo where, in a 3-hectare area, a large assortment of drinks for any purse and taste are offered by 3,000 restaurants, night clubs, bars, cafes and snack bars. There are 3,000 cozy vacant lots and scattered storerooms at the disposal of Muscovites who wish to drink. The logic is primitive: the fewer drinking establishments, the fewer drunkards. However, practice does not confirm this law, fabricated by bureaucrats: in Moscow, where for a long time hardly a single beer hall is left, 330,000 people—almost 1,000 per day—ended up in the "sobering-up" station last year.

Only Islamic states struggle against alcohol use: Turkey, Iran, Malaysia, Pakistan and others. Why should they set an example for us?

What do the figures say? Judging from various selective questionnaires and studies, of the 150-160 million drinkers in our country, evidently, about 20-30 million "abuse," and of these only 5-6 million are chronic alcoholics. Of the 120-130 million non-drinkers, 80 million are children and the other 40-50 million are convinced or involuntary teetotalers. This arithmetic apportionment alone suggests that it would have been more reasonable to organize an anti-alcohol march.

Incidentally, any drinker who does not want to become a ruined profligate is also prepared to invest all efforts, in order to be a profligate as little as possible.

Many alcoholics themselves in no way wish to admit that they are alcoholics: they still have arrogance and something like the remnants of shame. It might have been possible tactfully and reasonably to involve them in a struggle against themselves.

Chronic alcoholics are another matter. Their drunkenness is not so much their fault, as their misfortune, and they cannot cope without medical specialists. As the latest studies by geneticists have shown, many of them have inherited alcoholism not even from their fathers and mothers, but almost from the monkeys. Here, it should help to study people who must not even smell alcohol.

What is the situation with the May 1985 resolution? Should it be considered erroneous? Why not deem it somewhat unilateral and improperly drafted? How many of these resolutions were there in the recent past, supposedly aimed at "the good," which we now try not to recall? Yet, we must remember. We must count up the purposely spent time, efforts and funds. We must not forget the economic and moral damage which was inflicted and we must learn an expensive lesson.

For some reason we do not remember the 1972 resolution "On Measures to Strengthen the Struggle Against Drunkenness and Alcoholism." Yet it contains almost everything which was later repeated in the 1985 resolution: a reduction in the production of strong beverages, fines and all kinds of other punishments for drunkards and leaders who tolerate them, punishments for speculation in alcoholic beverages and moonshine, for drunken driving, etc. In general, this is all just an emphasis on coercion, colored with an abstract appeal "to broadly develop cultural and upbringing work."

One cannot say that the 1972 resolution was implemented without proper administrative ardor. Throughout the country, hundreds of thousands of committees on the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism were created in ispolkoms and enterprises. The campaign began sufficiently noisily. Party and other leaders at all levels were made strictly responsible for it. Millions of anti-alcohol lectures were given and millions of kilograms of paper were used up for anti-alcohol plans and reports. However, the campaign began to spin its wheels

from the very start and gradually became hopelessly formalized. It is good that they did not manage to bulldoze the vineyards.

However, that was in the time of putting on a show, of insufficient glasnost, raging bureaucratism and so forth. Now, what prevents us from solving the problem essentially "humanely?" Right now, it will not disgrace anyone if we admit that the May 1985 resolution was prepared in the depths, in the spirit of the just recently-ended "stagnant period," and that the new thinking of restructuring had not been successfully reflected within it.

If the former crude anti-alcohol pressure on the population continues, we risk entering critical condition in some areas. By May 1988, the sugar reserve, which had been maintained from year to year, was used up in the country in 12 months. The Ministry of Trade fears that in order to get rid of the "sugar strain," we must purchase 1,800,000 additional tons of sugar abroad, which will cost billions of dollars. And this is in the country with the world's highest sugar production. In ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, Academician Abalkin explains that the current serious condition of the economy is due to three serious blows which the economy was forced to endure since the beginning of restructuring. The first blow was Chernobyl. The second is the difficulties which are arising with obtaining hard currency on the international market. The third, strange though it may seem, is the anti-alcohol campaign, which has become a cause of "colossal deficits" in the economy.

How can the damage inflicted on the general well-being of the 160 million people considered unable to refuse alcohol, who have thus fallen into the unpleasant position of the persecuted, be measured? Is not the indifferent attitude of such large bodies of people to raising labor productivity and to the vigorous movement of restructuring in general a hindrance?

Judging by everything, we have lost today's anti-alcohol campaign, and moonshine making is not the only form of serious damage. It is already a question of the great political costs caused by this campaign, which were stated, in particular, by Academician Primakov from the rostrum of the 19th Party Conference. Yet, could it have been otherwise, if in its present form the campaign seems like an experiment conducted on the population?

How can a sudden turn-around be made? The question is not simple. However, certain steps seem obvious.

Wine lines, which humiliate millions of people, must be eliminated.

A price for alcohol should be set, such that moonshine making becomes undesirable for the majority due to considerations of harm to their health, the risk of punishment and its immorality in general. It should also be set at a level, such that the consumption of sugar in the country drops by 1.5 million tons in response.

The apparatus of the All-Union Society for the Struggle for Sobriety, which sometimes discredits the humane aspirations of those who are truly concerned about the health and well-being of their drinking fellow citizens, must be sharply reduced. The organization of local societies for sobriety, which would be genuinely volunteer associations of like-minded people, should be encouraged, and no centralization whatsoever should be foisted upon them.

All "white lies" in the anti-alcohol propaganda system, which has reached the level of anti-alcohol profanation, must be eliminated. In striving to frighten people from using alcohol, for some time propagandists have been customarily making ridiculous assertions, not in keeping with simple reality. Such propaganda evokes indifference and even a negative reaction, yet millions of rubles and man-hours are spent to no purpose. A mass anti-alcohol falsehood is often the cause of isolated personal tragedies.

Alcoholism must be recognized as a disease in fact, and not in words. Those afflicted with alcoholism must not be used for inexpensive manpower in plants, under the guise of labor therapy. The question of payment for sick leave while being treated for alcoholism, which was abolished in 1972, should be raised.

Alcoholics must not be tormented only for refusal of treatment by compulsory confinement to an LTP, in fact a 2-year deprivation of freedom. Use of the LTP should be limited to cases in which refusal of treatment is combined with chronic asocial behavior (robbery, maladaptation to labor, homelessness, etc.).

It is entirely possible, as surveys also indicate, that most of our population considers sobriety the most sensible state in principle. However, most of them continue to drink for one or another reason, still not understood. The question is how and in what time period universal and definitive sobriety can be achieved. Obviously, we must all solve this together, both drinkers and non-drinkers, without insults and with complete mutual trust.

Let there be many open debates. Let the people of the Ukraine and Russian argue among themselves, and not foist their opinions upon the people of Georgia or Armenia, where the situation and history of relations with alcohol differ sharply. Let adult people themselves make the choice: to drink or not to drink, without an teacher with a lash. Possibly, a referendum is required, individually in each republic. Obviously, it is also not worth trying to make all territories fit the same anti-alcohol pattern in the immediate future. Meanwhile, the population has spontaneously "voted" on this issue by the long lines for alcohol and the rivers of moonshine.

Most likely, having tallied up the enormous outlays already expended for sobriety, to which we have hardly come noticeably closer, it would not do to be slow with a fundamental turn-around in anti-alcohol policy, in favor of greater conformity to the spirit of the times.

It has only just become known that a decision was made in the glorious city of Kiev to declare the capital of the Ukraine alcohol-free as of next year. How simple: just declare it. How many lives and millions of rubles will this unquestionably hopeless administrative experiment cost? If it came out of your own pocket, at the cost of your own health...

Moscow Youth Violence Prompts Emergency Meeting

18000219 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 29 Oct 88 p 4

[Article by V. Rudnev, legal advisor: "An Emergency Council in the Public Prosecutor's Office"]

[Text]On this occasion a coordinating council of Moscow law enforcement agencies was not planned beforehand and L. Baranov, the city prosecutor, convened an unscheduled emergency coordinating council. The fact is that recently skirmishes between youth groups have become more frequent in Moscow streets and city squares.

All day long on October 21, the militia was at a condition of increased readiness—the Moscow soccer team "Spartak" was playing the Kiev team "Dynamo". Along both sides of the militia cordons there were aggressive crowds of young people—"fans", who were prepared to attack each other at a moment's notice. And although "Spartak" won the game, the militia reports recorded a draw: they managed to disperse the "fans" and departed safely to their homes.

Several days earlier intervention by the militia prevented a youth skirmish—approximately 80 people on each side—near a dormitory at the Recipient of the Order of Lenin and the Order of the Red Banner for Labor Moscow Higher Technical Institute named after Bauman. At that time a fight between teenagers from Cheremushkinsky and Solntsevskiy rayons was contemplated. Their peers from a Moscow suburb and the microrayon Novokosino intended to "clarify relations" in the same manner. The actions of the militia averted a misfortune.

The operational situation in the city, with which A. Yegorov, the deputy chief of Moscow Criminal Investigation Department, has become familiar, is alarming: since the beginning of the year, 36 attempts to organize massive fights with the total number of participants reaching 4200 persons have already been registered. Passions ran especially high in September and October. For the purposes of stopping the hooligan gang attacks, 452 persons were delivered to the militia agencies. Of these 62 were in secondary schools, 134 in vocational training institutions, 59 in technical secondary schools and colleges, and 143 in workers and employees collectives. The rest were not working or studying anywhere. Many of those delivered were called to account for petty

hooliganism, violating the anti-alcohol laws, and malicious disobedience to militia workers. Several criminal cases are being investigated.

A. Yegorov concluded: "The militia is managing to control the situation, thwart the illegal intentions of the youth groups, and prevent massive fights."

But city prosecutor L. Baranov, the chairman of the coordinating council, shifted the conversation to a different plane.

"For the present we are managing to suppress the skirmishes between teenagers in the Moscow streets," he stated. "But the lessons of the youth disturbances in Kazan, Morshansk and Alapayevsk compel us to also evaluate the Moscow situation as imminent and critical."

It is difficult not to share the city prosecutor's alarm. The law enforcement agencies in the cities mentioned by him appeared on the "scene" after the situation had reached the breaking point. One can understand the resolutions of the coordinating council, which has made it incumbent upon the rayon law enforcement agencies—the court and militia—to define more clearly the questions of responsibility regarding the organizers and instigators of street fights and to make more extensive use of administrative and criminal proceedings against the guilty.

Expect trouble in those areas where the national education agencies, the trade union, the Komsomol, and the Councils of People's Deputies are not involved in working with youth groups and in those areas where only the militia look after the teenagers.

What did those who were called to the coordinating council bring with them? What did they propose for correcting the situation? L. Kezina, First Deputy Chairman for the Moscow Committee for National Education, feels that it is necessary to make parents more accountable, to strengthen ideological influence on teenagers by using the mass media, to increase the number of personnel in the rayon departments of national education, and to organize a special section of the ispolkom for working with young people. In the opinion of V. Pankin, the secretary of the Moscow City Chapter of the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League, in the first instance, the organization of popular forms of leisure for teenagers is required: defense-sport camps, military-patriotic clubs, creating an entertainment industry for young people, and using the abilities of the cooperatives for these purposes. V. Stroganov, the secretary of the Moscow City Council of Trade Unions, declared the readiness of the trade unions to allocate money for youth clubs. D. Lebedev, chairman of the Moscow Soviet ispolkom, spoke out in favor of reorganizing the work of the commission on the affairs of minors.

Obviously, some sort of measures are required. But here one gets the impression that they are being proposed

more for deliberation, for a report, and for the authorities than for the actual problem. Moreover, all of this has already been done—department staffs have been increased and decreased, and discotheques have been opened, and military-athletic games have been organized. But the teenagers do not go to the boring “dignified” program, they do not want to march in platoons, and they avoid meetings with functionaries. We can invest a little more money in the former ventures. Only the former question remains open: all things considered, who will look after the teenagers on the street? Will it be only the militia?

V. Rudnev,
Legal Advisor.

Mironenko on Viability of Komsomol, Relations With Informals

18000268 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian No 43, 26 Oct 88 p 2

[Viktor Mironenko interviewed by Grant Apresyan:
“Viktor Mironenko Learning the Lessons”]

[Text] [Apresyan] The Komsomol has had occasion to hear many different reproaches and severe criticism directed toward it in recent years. And even the Komsomol, itself, “did not spare” itself at the 20th Congress and at the Central Committee plenums of the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League (VLKSM). In your opinion, what are the lessons here?

[Mironenko] I recently read the transcripts of the first ten VLKSM Congresses. It was as if I found myself at the midst of a furious struggle and I was looking into the clashes of opinions and the indefatigable works of the organization, which we established in 1918. Years have passed since then and the life of the Komsomol organizations continues, but... during the period of the “thaw” questions began to arise. Where, why, and in the name of what are we headed? The era of stagnation buried the young generation’s hope of actively participating in the social processes. The crude outline of a centralized union, which was based on the command style of leadership, became firmly established.

But meanwhile, I am convinced, the administration is contraindicative in principle to the Komsomol. The outcome is not all-important, and to be sure this outcome must be achieved democratically. In my opinion, this is the most important lesson.

At the 3rd Congress of the All-Russian Communist Youth League, V.I. Lenin stated: “The Communist Youth League must be the shock troops, which in any job will render assistance and display its initiative and innovation”. This is what we are currently lacking.

[Apresyan] In your report to the 20th Congress of the VLKSM Central Committee, you courageously discussed the crisis of young people’s confidence in the

Komsomol. A year and a half has passed. Is the situation improving, what has been accomplished, and what still needs to be done?

[Mironenko] Everything depends upon what you compare it with. I would not say that we have succeeded in restoring the League’s prestige yet. But, I feel, we have proven—the Komsomol can be informal. Finally, a personal attitude toward the activities of the League has started to emerge in many young people. And this, you should agree, is significant. Let us take just one of these trends. Two All-Union gatherings of “Afghanistan veterans” and of reserve soldiers were organized by the Central Committees in Ashkhabad and Novosibirsk. They completed a course in Afghanistan—a special and robust nation. They are reaching out for grave causes and they require the most delicate care. Through the Bureau of International Youth Tourism we will send up to 300 disabled “Afghanistan veterans” annually to Czechoslovakia for prosthetic treatment. Is this too little? Yes, our debt to them is too great to be repaid. But this is nevertheless better than talking and not doing anything. Or, for example the Ministry of Housing and Communal Services (MZhKKh). This year complexes comprise three percent of the new housing starts in the country. This is a drop in the sea of young families, who are waiting for housing. And nevertheless it is a start.

Let us touch upon finances. The VLKSM has unused funds. When there is a shortage of goods, it is difficult to put all one’s funds to good use. We just could not bring ourselves to use even part of it on developing the scientific and technical creativity of young people. Many excellent undertakings have been lost because they lacked material support. Today there is an idea to invest several hundred million “Komsomol” rubles in a special bank for young people’s initiatives.

During the last year and a half, a literal revolution was taking place in the Komsomol—the question of authority was being resolved. Authority is vested completely in the primary Party organs. The freedom to elect the leaders has been restored. During this time, the Central Committee has not once used an imperious tone and it has not permitted itself “to command”.

We have also started to think seriously about what type of person should be a member of the Komsomol. The maximum membership of the Komsomol was 42 million people. Today it is 36 million. But on the other hand, this figure has become significant. Now, before joining an organization, young people think about it more. And having joined, they aspire to act, and not to be counted.

[Apresyan] In recent years, a multitude of informal youth associations has sprung up. What kinds of prospects do you see for relations between the Komsomol and the informals?

[Mironenko] The emergence of the informals, in my opinion, is the result of the increase in the political

activeness of young people, which we have always called for, but after obtaining it, we were intensely frightened. However, let us nevertheless understand: what do we want from them? To unite all the wholesome forces of young people in support of perestroika. Then let us unite and not separate. For example, what do you think of the term "political training"? This traditionally boring in form and content stock phrase also does not evoke my sympathy—we know the price of enduring an hour of banal enlightenment. Two weeks ago, the first meeting of youth political clubs was held in Moscow. In essence, these are the informals. I cannot recall another occasion when there were such heated discussions concerning the widest range of problems. How can this not be political training?

[Apresyan] "LITERATURNAYA GAZETA's" interest in the links between the VLKSM Central Committee and our creative young people is understandable? Today are they not confined to the conferment of the title of Leninist Komsomol Prize laureates? Incidentally, it was not that long ago that the nomination of the new laureates was concluded. And as is tradition the representatives from literature and journalism were again far fewer than the personalities from the sphere of art.

[Mironenko] The commission for awarding the prizes was made up of young, talented people, who submitted creative applications. For example, Yuriy Polyakov and Yuris Podniyek. At the same time the plane of exactingness is being raised. Time will tell—who will be able to overcome this. I will note in passing that the M. Gorkiy contest for the best first book of a young author and the All-Union N. Ostrovskiy literary contest for the best work about Soviet young people are being conducted especially for young literary personalities.

The VLKSM Central Committee supports our creative young people to the best of its ability. With our assistance several young playwrights, whose plays are already running in the theaters,—Nikolay Kolyada, Valeriy Chepurin, and Pyotr Sokolov—are doing apprenticeships with acknowledged masters—A. Shteyna, L. Zhukhovitskovo, and I. Vishnevskoy. I will not cover up the fact that it was difficult for these lads "to break through", but they obsessively pursued their goal. How can this not be an example for others, who feel that something is within their power?

[Apresyan] Thank you for the conversation. Allow me to wholeheartedly congratulate the Komsomol on its 70th anniversary and to wish it perpetual youth.

Interview conducted by Grant Apresyan

Komsomol Discussion on Nationality Problems, Passports

18300186 Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian
9 Oct 88 p 3

[Discussion led by correspondents N. Natadze and M. Yelingulashvili: "The National Question: Openness, Dialogue". First two paragraphs are source introduction]

[Text] General human and national values: Are they contradiction or unity?

The long and in-depth definition of the topic of discussion which took place in the "Amirani" youth club could in principle from the very beginning be reduced to a shorter definition—"national problems". Unfortunately, it turned out that the discussion itself on the very first day took on an even narrower direction and was ultimately reduced to a discussion of the question of "whether the column 'nationality' should appear in the passport", as well as to a listing by the discussion participants of the genealogy of their parents and friends. Well, a discussion is always impromptu, and one can never guarantee its successful course. Moreover, the number of participants and the approximate time allowed for discussion were incompatible, and each one tried to say his own piece. Therefore, we decided to remain at the club and, together with several of the participants of the discussion which had just been held, try to continue the conversation on this, one of the most burning topics of the present day.

[Correspondent] If even we, the ideological workers, were not able to hold a serious discussion of this topic, this testifies most clearly how our society is not ready for an in-depth and serious look at inter-national problems. Let us learn. Let us learn to look at problems in a broader and, most importantly, in a more sincere manner.

[Meruzhan Ter-Gulanyan] It seems we always knew how to look more sincerely. It is the ability to exchange truthful information that we lack. Society was trained to do this for a long time. And even today we are taught, right from the school desk. What textbooks do school children use to study history! Why, this is the history not of the union of republics, the union of peoples, but only of the Russian people. In the best case, children learn about their national heroes from two or three lines of one-sided, empty information. Today we level unfounded accusations at historians for these gaps, forgetting that the pages of history were rewritten not at their whim, but by order of the politicians.

[Valeriu Butnaru] Two sources of any nation, any people are history and language. And, is the situation any better here with language?! I would like to mention this because today for Moldavia this is one of the most acute questions. Our language is the only Romance language in the country. Its phonetic laws require a Latin written language. In the early 40's, by the "wise" directive from

above, cyrillic was artificially imposed upon the language. Today we are fighting to return our alphabet.

[Ter-Gulanyan] As yet without success? I would not be too surprised at that. We have formed a rather unique attitude toward national languages. I will not theorize, but will simply present an example. Five years ago our publishing house had an urgent need for newly cast typesetting. We sent a letter to the Leningrad enterprise which fills such orders. We received a very expressive response. You Armenians, they said, together with the Georgians have become rather annoying to us. Only you retain some kind of different alphabets. It is time to changed over to normal ones.

Perhaps we should not even react seriously to such stupidity, were it not for the fact that we often have occasion to encounter such a careless attitude toward our national dignity.

[Marianne Mikko] In Tallinn there is a rayon called Lasnamyaye. When I go there by bus, I feel like an outsider in my own city. You only hear Russian spoken. Seventy-five percent of the population there is Russian speaking.

[Butnaru] When they bring in not only specialists, but also various workers to build a plant in Moldavia, workers of whom, thank God, there is an abundance in our our republic, and then they even provide them with housing without a waiting list (by the way, intensifying this already acute problem), you can't help but think that this is politics...

[Mikko] The question is not only one of language. The national problem rests on the state of culture and spiritual integrity of the people. Estonian culture has always been oriented toward Scandinavian. Traditions are traditions, and Russian culture has not entered into them. The same is true also for the language. You, of course, have noticed that all Estonians speak Russian very poorly. Yet our Constitution lists Russian as the state language since the 40's.

[Butnaru] As in almost all the union republics, except for the Transcaucasus. It is not even a matter of being written, but of how this is reflected in the everyday realities. I go to the Kishinev store "Druzha" for books written in Rumanian and can only buy a handbook on bee keeping and human anatomy there. In order to buy the literature which I want I have to go to Moscow.

[Ter-Gulanyan] The absence of ties with the homeland's culture and remoteness from it have led to a crisis situation in Nagorniy Karabakh. Karabakh is not a territorial problem. It is a problem of national self-consciousness. And it is especially sad when these events are presented non-objectively and tendentiously to this day. This is true primarily of the central press and Central Television. The problem of Nagorniy Karabakh did not emerge today. It was presented in the 30's and in

the 60's as well. But then it was successfully "hushed up". Today's policy of glasnost [openness] has made it possible to raise it again, but this time openly, in full voice. We must speak about this while the matter can still be remedied. In Nakhichevan this already cannot happen. The percentage of Armenian population has tangibly decreased there. In Nagorniy Karabakh the Armenian population today comprises almost 80 percent. They must feel themselves to be Armenians. They have a right to this, which is written in the Constitution. If the constitutional paragraphs do not work, that means they are "not right". Yet the central means of mass information present everything as though the people are wrong. It is not the people who exist for the Constitution, but rather the Constitution exists for the people. If a jacket is too short for me, I will not cut off my arms. I will alter the jacket.

[Correspondent] Let us leave the central publications aside. Yet there are also local, republic publications. What keeps them from telling the full truth?

[Ter-Gulanyan] That is our problem. In each republic, information about the other republics may be received only through the central agencies. In my opinion, the question of instituting correspondent centers in each republic is long overdue. If MOLODEZH GRUZII had its own correspondent in Armenia, you and your readers would know much more about us. And the same is true in any republic.

[Butnaru] And as long as there is [no such correspondent], we know little about each other. This leads to insulting and outdated stereotypes. "Sunny Moldavia", "flowering gardens"... And Latvia is only basketball. Georgia is tea, wine, something else, you know better than I. We too, the workers of the press, necessarily cultivate these stereotypes. Therefore, I am in full agreement with the idea of local correspondents.

[Ter-Gulanyan] Moreover, we must have complete information also about our fellow countrymen abroad. One of them could take on the role of a local correspondent, especially since it would not be difficult for the Armenian communities abroad to finance this work.

This is very important to us. According to the data of the Armenian church, there are more of our fellow countrymen living abroad than in the Homeland. We are an integral whole. Yet even here our policy is built, in my opinion, far from wisely. Contacts are limited only to cultural ties, and not very extensive ones at that. Soviet Armenians cannot have other ties—for example, business or commercial—with Armenians abroad. Why? After all, we cannot consider these people to be emigrants. They did not leave for political reasons. Rather, they were forced to leave their Homeland during the genocide.

[Eduard Tyuyr] We too are resolving a similar question in our republic: How to deal with the Estonians living

outside the boundaries of our country? In general, most of them left the USSR in '44. They are considered almost fascists, because many of them went over to the side of the Germans during the war. However, this was not because the ideology of nazism was dear to them, but because the Stalinist regime made existence in Estonia absolutely unbearable. The annexation of our republic was forced, being the result of the well-known Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. There was no revolutionary situation, as they have tried to maintain up until recent times.

[Correspondent] Should we understand this to mean that the goal of the popular movement which has developed in Estonia today is the restoration of historical justice, i.e., secession?

[Tyuyr] No, although there is a group of people which does hold such positions. In general we accept the realities, but this does not mean that we agree to give up our national sovereignty. The following fact tells us how vitally important this circumstance is for the Estonians. The percentage of suicides among young people was very high in the republic until quite recently. Today, when a popular movement recognized even at the official level has developed, the young people have seen the real prospect of creating Estonia as the Estonians would like to see it.

[Correspondent] In our discussion we constantly assume that the concept of "nationality" and "national self-awareness" are indivisible. Why do you think national self-awareness takes on active forms in some places, while in others it goes no farther than discussions about patriotism and self-exclusiveness?

[Butnaru] I cannot substantiate this scientifically. However, it seems to me that history can answer this question. As early as 1812, when the mass colonization of our country by Russian czarism began, when our native language and its instruction were prohibited, they stubbornly tried to impose upon the people the notion of their inability to solve their own problems independently. This process continued even later, already in the 20th century, in the 40's. National self-awareness was dulled. Unfortunately, even today we have no equal dialogue with the official organs, such as they have, for example, in Estonia.

[Tyuyr] And that has only been in the last few months.

[Ter-Gulanyan] National self-awareness takes on active forms when an extreme, critical situation arises whose solution becomes a question of life and death for the people.

[Correspondent] The process of perestroika and democratization has given a natural outlet to the national question which was previously held in check. Where, in your opinion, is the guarantee that the growth of national self-awareness will not lead to its outgrowth into nationalism?

[Butnaru] I am collecting signatures for a petition to return the Latin alphabet to the Moldavian language. I am considered a nationalist.

Here is what I think. It is easy to give guarantees. All we have done all these years is "not notice" many problems and "express our assurance" that everything is in order in the national question. Therefore, let us not keep silent.

Doctors Sent to Central Asia To Reduce Infant Mortality

18300086 Moscow *KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA* in Russian 14 Oct 88 p 2

[Article by A. Likhanov, writer, board chairman of the Soviet Children's Foundation imeni V. I. Lenin: "Landing Operation of Kindness"]

[Text] Teams of doctors dispatched by the Soviet Children's Foundation are saving the children of Central Asia and Kazakhstan from many illnesses. A medical landing party from the foundation is presently in the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan. Prior to this, such a landing party operated in Chitinskaya Oblast.

How do you explain such a terribly sad statistic: 130,000 of our little fellow citizens die annually without having lived as long as one year? It is not from hunger. It is not easy to break down into black and white the reasons for this most severe problem. Ecological, social, cultural, religious, medical, sanitary and hygienic problems are all involved here... But most important is the fact that mother and child have too long been outside the focus of society's social attention.

The summit of the irrational "economizing" with respect to protecting motherhood and childhood is located in the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan. It is considered a most ordinary circumstance in this region that up to 70 percent of permanent hospitals which treat infection are located in barely converted premises, 90 percent lack a sewage system, 65 percent have no running hot water, and over 20 percent must have water transported in. A specific example can be seen in the Chardarinskaya TsRB [expansion unknown] in Kazakhstan's Chimkentskaya Oblast where a team of Estonian medical specialists is working. A few old, tilted buildings long in need of repair are filled to overflowing with patients. There are one-and-a-half times as many people as there are beds. The problem is solved quite simply—put mother and child in one bed.

We look at another region and find the situation essentially the same. Of 433 public health facilities in Tashauzskaya Oblast of the Turkmen SSR, only 28 are constructed according to standard design. To get to the point, there is not a single children's hospital for infectious diseases in the republic. An infection treatment section was set up in the oblast children's hospital for the arrival of our teams. The wards have neither tables nor curtains—it is a barracks.

The medical equipment in half of the public health facilities for children in the Tajik SSR is 100 percent worn out. Critical shortages of medical equipment and medicines have become a standard condition in the republic.

The overall result is that every third child who dies in the country comes from the Central Asian republics. Far from the idea of categorically "branding" or exposing the situation—and it would be late for this—it is a dramatic fact that life has for decades bypassed the population of many oblasts of this region, not only in the construction necessary to meet everyday social needs, but in cultural, medical, sanitary and hygienic knowledge as well.

Imagine that, even in summertime, most parents seldom bathe their children and do not change their underwear on a regular basis. There is no water, no bath, no toilets. With an abundance of fruits and vegetables available, the main food ration of pregnant women and children remains, as before, tea and cake. It is not surprising that most children are retarded in their physical development. They begin to walk at the age of fifteen months on the average.

From 20 to 40 percent of the children are born from blood-related marriages. They are observed to have severe forms of anemia, rickets, hypotrophy, frequent and severe hereditary diseases leading to national degeneration.

A resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers was recently adopted concerning participation of the Soviet Children's Foundation imeni V. I. Lenin in the struggle against infant mortality in several regions of our country. A medical campaign by our foundation and the USSR Ministry of Health is underway a second month now in the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan. More than two thousand volunteer doctors from the Ukraine, Belorussia, Latvia, Estonia and many oblasts of the Russian Federation are waging—and I am not afraid to use the word—a real battle for the lives of children in the Central Asian region.

There are some initial results—the level of infant mortality here has decreased an average of six per thousand. This means hundreds of children's lives have been saved. But victory is still a long ways away.

The Children's Foundation and USSR Ministry of Health addressed an open letter to the leaders of party and soviet organs in these republics and oblasts on the subject of infant mortality. If the critical situation sick children are in does not change in the coming months, if the efforts of party, soviet and social organizations do not facilitate swift elimination of this misfortune, then many thousands of mothers and fathers who have lived through the tragedy of their children will hardly be able to believe that the state and society are serious and decisive in providing measures to protect children's lives.

We must explain to them the causes and consequences of serious child diseases. Far too numerous are the

instances where a child is brought to the hospital in a condition realistically beyond help. Of 738 children who died over a six-month period in Tashauzskaya Oblast, 264 died at home without the aid of a doctor. This is one aspect. Another is no less alarming—delivery of necessary medicines is falling through. "I am on the verge of a nervous breakdown," a Moscow doctor of rheumatic diseases told us. "Two children died right in front of my eyes and we continue to 'run' glucose. We don't have the necessary medicines in critical situations and our helplessness is showing."

The high infant mortality level is often related to a lack of medical staff, inadequate numbers of doctors and mid-level medical personnel. Today these staffs are calculated based on each ten thousand in population—for the average region in Russia and Central Asia as well. But how do you tie this in with the number of births? There is a tremendous difference!

Wouldn't it therefore be more logical to establish a staffing policy based, for example, per thousand births?

The overwhelming majority of people who write letters to the foundation and its newspaper "Family" support the organization of medical campaigns to save children—the majority, but not all. There is an opinion which considers it not worthwhile to divert doctors from their main jobs and send them to Central Asia, as if to say that this impairs their primary practice. But can a doctor, having taken an oath to humaneness and mercy, remain indifferent to the grief of another people? These teams are also working in 14 locations in the Russian republic.

Our envoys do not hide the fact that this work is hard on them. But they see their best reward in the flow of people rushing in to see them day and night, seeking help, consultation and advice.

Our goal is not simply to organize medical landing parties—we must establish a system for the medical and social battle against infant mortality. Time will suggest the direction, the specific means and the scale of our activity.

How can we possibly reconcile ourselves to a situation in which pregnant women, nursing mothers and children work on tobacco plantations and in cotton fields sprayed with pesticides? How can we accept a situation in which a community's only source of water is a polluted irrigation ditch? Is it not the business of society, and of the Children's Foundation, to "veto" once and for all every manifestation of "industrial egoism"?

Is an example necessary? Every year 280 tons of harmful chemical substances is discharged into the atmosphere around the city of Salavat, in the Bashkir ASSR, by enterprises of the oil refining and petroleum chemistry industries. According to data provided by Doctor of Medical Sciences V. Lupandin, the number of child twitchers (i.e., children who exhibit an involuntary twitching of certain muscles of the face, hands and body)

in Salavat has increased sharply over the past five years. Psychological disorder (neurosis, retardation) in 4-7 year-olds is 1.5 times as great as for the country as a whole.

This entire set of problems is the priority concern of the Children's Foundation. The Institute of Specially Authorized Doctors of the Soviet Children's Foundation and Chief Experts of the USSR Ministry of Health was established and has been charged with the basic responsibility here. A country-wide competition has been conducted to fill its positions.

With regard to the rights and obligations of these specially authorized doctors, their chief responsibility is to establish state programs for child health in each endangered region.

Emphasizing the special significance of the specially authorized doctors, the Soviet Children's Foundation imeni V. I. Lenin is also entrusting them with the important social responsibility of strengthening the authority of pediatricians and inculcating the medical community of this region with a greater sense of professional responsibility.

Estonia To Switch to 'Zone Time'
18000075a Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 30 Sep 88 p 3

[Article by F. Kaazik, ETA [Estonian News Agency]:
"Estonia—Zone Time"]

[Text] As is well known, some central departments declined the first petition of the Council of Ministers of our republic for conversion to zone time. A second petition was sent by the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee and the ESSR Council of Ministers to USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N. Ryzhkov.

A review of our petition was made on September 28 at the office of the first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, V. Murakhovskiy, in which the first deputy chairman of the ESSR Council of Ministers, A. Soydlar, took part.

"Insofar as the arguments we presented were convincing, the commission, which included representatives of various union republics, completely agreed with our proposal," said A. Soydlar. "Estonia has converted to zone time. Power engineering, from whom we expected the most objections, has also given its consent to the conversion to the new time, since it will facilitate load distributions during peak hours."

"A working group to resolve technical issues associated with the conversion to zone time was created last week. Its includes the leaders of all the transport organizations of our republic, Estonglavenergo [Estonian Main Power Administration], the Tallinn city ispolkom, ESSR Gostelradio [State Committee for Radio and Television] and some other organizations, i.e. all those directly affected by this conversion. Since Latvia and Lithuania have not as yet appealed officially to the USSR government with a petition for conversion to zone time, certain difficulties could arise in the operations of rail transport and on bus routes, since they operate outside the borders of the republic. This factor is not a decisive one, however, and cannot affect our conversion in any way."

"How will the conversion to zone time take place?"

"In March of next year, when the conversion to daylight savings time takes place, we will not move the hands of our clocks ahead an hour. We will thus establish daylight savings time in relation to zone time.

"In September of 1989 we will move our clock hands ahead an hour and thereby accomplish the complete conversion to zone time. Beginning in 1990 we will introduce daylight savings time in relation to zone time, on common grounds, as has always been done in all of Europe. I think it will be convenient to use the term 'Estonian time' in relation to the time that will be in effect beginning next year."

"The members of the working group adhere to the opinion that it will take us three or four months to

resolve the various technical issues. I think that new traffic schedules should have been printed up by March, and the corresponding displays in place at railroad stations and airports. And we should get accustomed to the fact that we will have to take the time difference into account when traveling outside the republic."

"Will the conversion to zone time in Estonia be reflected in any official document?"

"Insofar as the conversion to zone time also affects the interests of other republics and all-union departments, it will be registered in the form of the appropriate document of the USSR Council of Ministers. The government of the republic will of course also adopt a document resolving a series of specific issues."

BSSR Union of Writers Conducts Popular Front Registration

18000286a Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 6 Nov 88 p 3

[Article by BELTA correspondent G. Novikov: "A Flyer Has Come to the Editorial Offices: What Lies Behind the Facts?"]

[Text] In the morning mail, the editors received a "samizdat" flyer with the signature "Popular Front" across the entire page. It is short and therefore we will give the entire text: "We are establishing support groups for the Popular Front of Belorussia at places of work and residence. Register at the address: Minsk, Frunze Boulevard 5; BSSR Writers Union."

Knowing that the republic Union of Writers has not yet precisely defined its position regarding this new phenomenon in social life, we turned to the chairman of the BSSR Writers Union board of directors, Maksim Tank, for a commentary.

"This is the first time I have heard that our creative union has given over its spaces as a headquarters for the National Front organizational committee," he answered. "It is possible that one of our employees took such an initiative. I will ask immediately for a clarification and that you be given complete information."

The secretary of the BSSR Writers Union board, Valeriy Skvortsov, was on the phone.

"The House of Writers is not the headquarters of the National Front organizational committee for the simple reason," Valeriy Aleksandrovich said, "that the writers' party meeting turned down the point in the resolution in support of the National Front." We will be able to express our attitude toward the movement only when its program, its political platform, has been determined and when the purposes and tasks of this movement have been precisely stated. We have considered it simply unwise to

vote for what we do not know. We have decided to revisit this question after the program documents of the front have been worked out. As concerns the headquarters of the Popular Front, then I underscore once more that the House of Writers is not such.

We were interested how the address of the Union of Writers came to be on the flyer. Valeriy Skvortsov made the suggestion that this question might be answered by Ales Yemelyanov, a literary consultant at the Writers Union and an activist in the movement for creation of the Popular Front.

"Everything written in the flyer is correct," answered Aleksandr Mikhaylovich. "I am conducting the registration. You can confirm to your readers that, with full authority in the name of the organizational committee, I confirm that the address is accurate for today. Why for today? You yourself understand very well that they can ask us to leave here at any moment."

So, this is the story. We will not judge who is right. But it seems to us that, in any situation, the directors of the creative union should at least know about what is going on in the House of Writers, and that employees, at a minimum, should inform their directors about this.

P.S. When this short article had been prepared for the press, Ales Yemelyanov phoned again and dictated a new version of the answer to our question. We give it without changes: "The organizational committee of the Belorussian national front 'Vozrozhdeniye' assigned to me the registration of support groups for the movement for restructuring. As I am employed at the BSSR Union of Writers, it is understandable that people came to the Writers Union. The question of whether the BSSR Writers Union will provide quarters for the work of the Belorussian National Front organizational committee has been raised at a party meeting of the writers organization. But, as of today, it remains open and it will be resolved at subsequent party meetings. And, meanwhile, applications are coming in and I am registering them."

BSSR CP CC Forms Commission to Rehabilitate Purge Victims

18000286b Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 12 Nov 88 p 1

[Unattributed report entitled: "In the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party: On A Commission of the Belorussian CP Central Committee Buro for Additional Study of Materials Related to the Repressions that Occurred During the Period of the 1930's-1940's and the Beginning of the 1950's"]

[Text] As is known, in the period of the cult of personality, many party and state leaders, economic and military personnel, scientists, cultural and artistic figures, workers and peasants, communists and non-members of

the party were subjected to unjust massive repressions. At the same time, not only those who suffered directly turned out to be the victims of tyranny and lawlessness, but also their children and relatives, who were labeled as "enemies of the people", as tools of foreign intelligence, and with other political accusations.

The process of reviving historical truth and justice that has begun under the leadership of the party demands full restoration of the good name of each innocent victim, all-round examination of new and already known earlier facts and documents that pertain to the tragic events of the past, thorough investigation of the crimes that were committed, and perpetuation of the memory of their victims.

For additional study of materials related to the repressions that occurred in the period of the 1930's - 1940's and the beginning of the 1950's, a Commission of the Belorussian CP Central Committee Buro has been established with the following membership:

Nikolay Ivanovich Dementey, secretary of the Belorussian CP Central Committee (chairman of the commission); Anatoliy Yevgenyevich Andreyev—member of the Belorussian CP Audit Commission, chairman of the Belorussian republic council of war and labor veterans; Veniamin Georgiyevich Baluyev—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee Buro, chairman of the Belorussian SSR KGB; Vasily Ivanovich Boris—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee Buro, chief of the Belorussian CP Central Committee department for organization of party work; Vladimir Gavrilovich Batukh—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee Buro, first deputy chairman of the BSSR Council of Ministers; Vladimir Sergeyevich Karavay—BSSR Minister of Justice; Vladimir Andreyevich Mikulich—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, deputy chairman of the BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Valeriy Andreyevich Pechennikov—Belorussian CP Central Committee secretary; Rostislav Petrovich Platonov—director of the Institute of Party History under the Belorussian CP Central Committee; Georgiy Stepanovich Tarnavskiy—BSSR Procurator.

The commission has been directed to thoroughly study materials related to the rehabilitation of persons who suffered from lawlessness and tyranny in the period of the cult of personality, and also to examine and introduce proposals concerning questions connected with immortalizing the memory and places of burial of the victims of the repressions.

It is recognized as expedient to establish corresponding commissions in the oblasts, cities, and rayons of the republic and to attract broad participation in their work on the part of representatives of soviet, trade union and Komsomol organs, non-professional associations of a patriotic and heroic and of an historic and local lore nature, and other social organizations and groups.

LiSSR 17 November Supsov Session Information Report

18000324a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
18 Nov 88 p 1

[Unattributed Information Report on 17 November LiSSR Supreme Soviet session]

[Text]

First Sitting

The 11th Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet 10th Session began at 1100 hours on 17 November 1988.

Comrades A. Brazauskas, V. Astrauskas, V. Berezov, S. Gedraytis, Y. Lukauskas, L. Maksimovas, V. Sakalayskas, L. Shepetis, P. Shileykis, K. Zaletskas and Yu. Sheris are taking part in the session.

The session was opened by L. Shepetis, chairman of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet honored with a minute's silence the memory of departed LiSSR Supreme Soviet deputies Ya. Leganovich, P. Mitskunas, V. Simniskis and A. Smirnov.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet received the report of V. Berezov, chairman of the Credentials Commission, member for the Utenskiy Electoral Okrug and chief of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department, on the results of the supplementary elections to the LiSSR Supreme Soviet for Radvilishkiy Rayon's Kutishkiy Electoral Okrug, Shilalskiy Rayon's Laukuvskiy Electoral Okrug, Telshyayskiy Rayon's Trishkyayskiy Electoral Okrug, Trakayskiy Rayon's Elektrenskiy Electoral Okrug and Vilnyusskiy Rayon's Yuodshilskiy Electoral Okrug and on the authority of the newly elected members.

The Supreme Soviet recognized the authority of Deputy L. Sabutis, elected for Radvilishkiy Rayon's Kutishkiy Electoral Okrug No 250, Deputy I. Yagminas for Shilalskiy Rayon's Laukuvskiy Electoral Okrug No 283, Deputy Yu. Paletskis for Telshyayskiy Rayon's Trishkyayskiy Electoral Okrug No 309, Deputy A. Mikuzhis for Trakayskiy Rayon's Elektrenskiy Electoral Okrug No 313 and Deputy L. Molotok for Vilnyusskiy Rayon's Yuodshilskiy Electoral Okrug No 340, all elected on 19 June of this year.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet adopted the following agenda for the session:

1. On a change in the composition of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

2. On the Plan of the LiSSR's Economic and Social Development for 1989 and the course of fulfillment of the Plan of the LiSSR's Economic and Social Development in 1988.

3. On the LiSSR budget for 1989 and on fulfillment of the LiSSR budget for 1987.

4. On the addition to the LiSSR Constitution of a provision regulating the official status of Lithuanian and on a change in the official symbols of the LiSSR.

5. On the draft USSR laws "Changes and Additions to the USSR Constitution (Basic Law)" and "Elections of USSR People's Deputies".

6. On the LiSSR Constitution.

7. Ratification of LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium edicts.

8. Request of V. Budrikis, member of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet confirmed the order of work of the sittings of the 10th Session.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet relieved R. Songayla, member for the Vizhuonskiy Electoral Okrug, of his duties as member of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium in connection with his retirement.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet unanimously elected A. Brazauskas, member for the Mazheyskiy Electoral Okrug and first secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, member of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The report on the Plan of the LiSSR's Economic and Social Development for 1989 and the course of fulfillment of the Plan of the LiSSR's Economic and Social Development in 1988 was delivered by B. Zaykauskas, member for the Krasnoarmeyskiy Electoral Okrug, deputy chairman of the LiSSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Gosplan, who also answered questions.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet heard the report of R. Sikorskis, member for the Alantskiy Electoral Okrug and minister of finance of the LiSSR, on the LiSSR budget for 1989 and fulfillment of the LiSSR budget for 1987.

The supporting report of the Plan and Budget and other standing commissions of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet on the second and third items on the agenda was delivered by A. Zhukauskas, member for the Svedasayskiy Electoral Okrug, chairman of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Plan and Budget Commission and vice president of the LiSSR Academy of Sciences.

The deputies then embarked on discussion of the reports on the Plan of the LiSSR's Economic and Social Development for 1989 and the course of fulfillment of the Plan of the LiSSR's Economic and Social Development in 1988 and also the LiSSR budget for 1989 and fulfillment of the LiSSR budget in 1987.

The following spoke in the debate: P. Stashkunas, member for the Viliyampolskiy Electoral Okrug and chairman of the Kaunas Gorispolkom, V. Kazakyavichyute, member for the Vidzgirskiy Electoral Okrug and facing lathe operator of the Alitus Experimental Housing Works, and L. Maksimovas, member for the Molodezhnyy Electoral Okrug and chairman of the Lithuanian Republic Council of Trade Unions.

This completed the first sitting of the 11th LiSSR Supreme Soviet 10th Session.

Second Sitting

The second sitting was chaired by L. Shepetis, chairman of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet continued discussion of the reports on the Plan of the LiSSR's Economic and Social Development for 1989 and on the course of fulfillment of the Plan of the LiSSR's Economic and Social Development in 1988 and also on the LiSSR budget for 1989 and fulfillment of the LiSSR budget for 1987.

The following spoke in the debate: K. Bekeris, member for the Zhidikskiy Electoral Okrug and chairman of the "Taribine Zhemaytiya" Kolkhoz, A. Berukshtis, member for the Dzherzhinskiy Electoral Okrug, chief of the LiSSR Ministry of Health Fourth Administration and senior physician of the Republic Hospital, V. Morkunas, member for the Babalninskiy Electoral Okrug and minister for Labor and Social Security of the LiSSR, Z. Travina, member for the Yuodupskiy Electoral Okrug, decatizer of Rokishkskiy Rayon's Yuodupskiy "Nyamunas" Woolen Cloth Factory, A. Matsaytis, member for the Muravskiy Electoral Okrug and first secretary of the Lithuanian Komsomol Central Committee, A. Markyavichene, member for the Kayshyadorskiy Electoral Okrug and cropping team leader of the experimental farm of the Lithuanian Veterinary Science Research Institute, A. Pekarskas, member for the Kintayskiy Electoral Okrug and director of Shilutskiy Rayon's I. Chyulada "Kintay" Fish Hatchery, Yu. Yutsyus, member for the Papilskiy Electoral Okrug and first secretary of the Birzhayskiy Raykom, and D. Masyan, member for the Shalchininskiy Electoral Okrug and head of the livestock section of Shalchininskiy Rayon's "Za mir" Kolkhoz.

After the break, the following spoke in the debate: V. Eynoris, member for the Skvaudvilskiy Electoral Okrug and chairman of the LiSSR State Committee for the Protection of Nature, V. Shchyaponene, member for the Zheymyalskiy Electoral Okrug and chief of the livestock section of Pakroyoskiy Rayon's "Komunaras" Kolkhoz,

A. Bernotas, member for the Zhyalvaskiy Electoral Okrug and chairman of the Ukmergskiy Rayispolkom, O. Khusainova, member for the Snechkusskiy Electoral Okrug and crane operator of the Western Construction Administration, S. Tamoshyunas, member for the Kupishkskiy Electoral Okrug and first secretary of the Kupishkskiy Raykom, and S. Yasyunas, member for the Nauyeyi-Akmyanskiy Electoral Okrug and minister of Construction Materials Industry of the LiSSR.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet resolved to conclude the debate on items two and three of the agenda.

Closing remarks on the Plan of the LiSSR's Economic and Social Development for 1989 and the course of fulfillment of the Plan of the LiSSR's Economic and Social Development in 1988 were delivered by Deputy B. Zaykauskas, who also answered questions.

A brief speech on the items discussed was delivered by V. Sakalauskas, chairman of the LiSSR Council of Ministers.

With two members voting against and five abstaining the LiSSR Supreme Soviet enacted the law "Plan of the LiSSR's Economic and Social Development for 1989" and with one member voting against and two abstaining adopted the decree "The Course of Fulfillment of the Plan of the LiSSR's Economic and Social Development in 1988".

Closing remarks on the LiSSR budget for 1989 and fulfillment of the LiSSR budget for 1987 were delivered by Deputy R. Sikorskis, who also answered questions.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet unanimously enacted the law "The LiSSR Budget for 1989" and adopted the decree "Confirmation of the Account of Fulfillment of the LiSSR Budget for 1987".

This completed the second sitting of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet 10th Session.

The session will continue on 18 November.

LiSSR 18 November Supsov Session Information Report

18000324b Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
19 Nov 88 p 1

[Unattributed report on the 18 November LiSSR Supreme Soviet session]

[Text]

Third Sitting

The third sitting of the 11th LiSSR Supreme Soviet 10th Session began at 1000 hours on 18 November 1988. It was chaired by L. Shepetis, chairman of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet.

The Supreme Soviet embarked on discussion of the fourth item on the session agenda—the addition to the LiSSR Constitution of a provision regulating the official status of Lithuanian and a change in the official symbols of the LiSSR.

Then a report on this item was delivered by V. Klikenene, member for the Zhemaytskiy Electoral Okrug of the city of Vilnius and deputy chairman of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet.

The following took part in the debate on this report: Yu. Martsinkyavichyus, member for the Palangskiy Electoral Okrug of the city of Palangi and people's writer of the republic, A.-Yu. Yuozenas-Baltushis, member for the Bagamyanskiy Electoral Okrug of the city of Vilnius and people's writer of the republic, A. Grishin, member for the Tsentralnyy Electoral Okrug of the city of Vilnius and electrician of Vilnius' "Plasta" Plant, A. Brazaytis, member for Shilutskiy Rayon's Shveksnaskiy Electoral Okrug and chief of the LiSSR Council of Ministers Main Administration for the Protection of State Secrets in the Press, A. Lenkyavichyute, member for Vilnius' Zherutskiy Electoral Okrug and leader of a team of the coil-winding bay of the Vilnius Radio Components Plant, and G. Lyakhov, member for the Aviatorskiy Electoral Okrug of the city of Vilnius and chief of the Lithuanian Civil Aviation Administration.

After the break, the following spoke in the debate: Yu. Nekroshyus, member for Kelmieskiy Rayon's Uzhvyantskiy Electoral Okrug and chairman of the LiSSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants and Book Trade, M. Adamavichyus, member for Vilnyusskiy Rayon's Mayshyagalskiy Electoral Okrug and chairman of Vilnyusskiy Rayon's Oktyabrskaya revolyutsiya Kolkhoz, and Y. Lukauskas, member for the Leporayskiy Electoral Okrug of the city of Shyaulay and chairman of the LiSSR People's Control Committee.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet resolved to end the debate on the report on the addition to the LiSSR Constitution of a provision regulating the official status of Lithuanian and a change in the official symbols of the LiSSR.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet unanimously enacted a law on supplementing the LiSSR Constitution (Basic Law) with article 77¹ regulating the official status of Lithuanian.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet approved the Supreme Soviet Presidium edict "Use of Lithuanian and Other Languages" and instructed the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to issue the draft of this edict for general discussion.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet unanimously enacted a law on articles 168 and 169 of the LiSSR Constitution, which legalize the national flag as the state flag of the LiSSR, and the "National Song" of Vincas Kudirka, as the national anthem of the LiSSR.

A. Brazauskas, member for Mazheykskiy Rayon's Mazheykskiy Electoral Okrug and first secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, spoke briefly about the change of emblem of the LiSSR. The LiSSR Supreme Soviet decided not to discuss this question at the 11th LiSSR Supreme Soviet 10th Session and to consider the White Vitis symbol, that is, the symbol of the chase, on a red background the national symbol of Lithuania.

The Supreme Soviet embarked on discussion of the question of the drafts of USSR laws "Changes and Additions to the USSR Constitution (Basic Law)" and "Elections of USSR People's Deputies".

The report on this question was delivered by Y. Guretskas, member for Klaypeda's Primorskiy Electoral Okrug and secretary of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The following spoke in the debate: V. Statulyavichyus, member for Vilnius' Nerisskiy Electoral Okrug and vice president of the LiSSR Academy of Sciences, R. Blyudzhys, member for Klaypeda's Khudozhnicheskii Electoral Okrug and driver of the Klaypeda Bus Fleet, Yu. Yarashyunas, member for Pasvalskiy Rayon's Salochskiy Electoral Okrug and chairman of Pasvalskiy Rayon's "Draugiste" Kolkhoz, V. Kubilyus, member for Kretingskiy Rayon's Darbenskiy Electoral Okrug and first secretary of the Kretingskiy Raykom, V. Povilauskas, member for Kedaynskiy Rayon's Shetaskiy Electoral Okrug and first secretary of the Kedaynskiy Raykom, the lawyer K. Moteka, guest of the session and member of the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroyka Seym Council, Yu. Pozhela, member for Vilnius' Virshulishkiy Electoral Okrug and president of the LiSSR Academy of Sciences, I. Misyunas, member for Klaypeda's Svyazistskiy Electoral Okrug and chairman of the LiSSR Supreme Court, and A. Zhukauskas, member for Anikshchyayskiy Rayon's Svedasayskiy Electoral Okrug and vice president of the LiSSR Academy of Sciences.

Several deputies spoke briefly from the floor on the question discussed.

After the break the LiSSR Supreme Soviet adopted by a majority a decree on the draft USSR laws "Changes and Additions to the USSR Constitution (Basic Law)" and "Elections of USSR People's Deputies".

Some time ago a working group, the constitution improvement panel, which formulated the draft LiSSR Constitution, was set up under the auspices of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The Supreme Soviet received the information from P. Kuris, leader of this panel, member for Shyaulay's Daynayskiy Electoral Okrug and minister of justice of the LiSSR, on the work that had been performed.

The following took part in the debate on the LiSSR Constitution: Ch. Karbauskis, member for Shyaulayskiy Rayon's Meshkuychskiy Electoral Okrug and chairman of Shyaulayskiy Rayon's "Uzh tayka" Kolkhoz,

Prof V. Landsbergis, guest of the session and member of the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroyka Seym Council, S. Gedraytis, member for Mazheykskiy Rayon's Tirkshlyayskiy Electoral Okrug and secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, A. Chuplinskas, member for Vilnius' Shnipishkskiy Electoral Okrug and general director of the Lithuanian "Sigma" Production Association, Z. Kazykonene, member for Kedaynskiy Rayon's Yosvaynskiy Electoral Okrug and leader of a cropping team of Kedaynskiy Rayon's Michurin Kolkhoz, Yu. Kuplyauskene, member for Vilnius' Valakampski Electoral Okrug and chairman of the Vilnius Engineering and Construction Institute Student Trade Union Committee, A. Zhalis, member for Klaypeda's Kommunskiy Electoral Okrug and chairman of the Klaypeda Gorispolkom, L. Sabutis, member for Radvilishkskiy Rayon's Kutishkskiy Electoral Okrug and republic prosecutor, Yu. Pozhela, member for Vilnius' Virshulishkskiy Electoral Okrug and president of the LiSSR Academy of Sciences, Yu. Paletskis, member for Telshyayskiy Rayon's Trishkyayskiy Electoral Okrug and head of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee Culture Department, and A. Brazauskas, member for Mazheykskiy Rayon's Mazheykskiy Electoral Okrug and first secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee.

The Supreme Soviet unanimously adopted a decree on the formation of an LiSSR Supreme Soviet constitutional commission to prepare the draft LiSSR Constitution.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet then turned to the seventh item on the agenda—ratification of LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium edicts.

The report was delivered by Y. Guretskas, member for Klaypeda's Primorskiy Electoral Okrug and secretary of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The Supreme Soviet unanimously enacted laws and adopted decrees which ratified the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium edicts promulgated in the period between the ninth and 10th sessions.

The Supreme Soviet then embarked on discussion of requests of LiSSR Supreme Soviet members. One such had been made prior to the session and included on the agenda, the rest, during the second sitting of the session.

Responding to Deputy V. Budrikis' request concerning an improvement in rural workers' work and living conditions was G. Konoplev, first deputy chairman of the LiSSR State Agro-Industrial Committee; responding to Deputy S. Imbrasas' request concerning secrecy of citizens' correspondence and telephone conversations on the territory of the republic was Republic Prosecutor L. Sabutis; responding to the request of Deputies R. Bartkayte, Yu. Kuplyauskene, A. Matsaytis, D. Blotskite, M. Pauzhene and M. Romanchikene concerning the expanded production of inexpensive furniture was K. Minetas, minister of timber industry; responding to the requests of Deputies Y. Mondvid-Byalozarene, R.

Nagene, I. Morozovene and A. Brazaytis in connection with an improvement in public supplies of medicines was Minister of Health I. Platukis; responding to the request of Deputy A. Meylus concerning the construction of facilities of the Agro-Industrial Committee was Gosstroy Chairman B. Sheshplauskis.

The Supreme Soviet adopted the appropriate decrees on these requests.

Responding to the questions of Deputy O. Khusainova which she raised in her speech at the second sitting was Yu. Sheris, first deputy chairman of the LiSSR Council of Ministers.

L. Shepetis, chairman of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet, reported that all items of the session agenda had been covered and declared the 11th LiSSR Supreme Soviet 10th Session closed.

Laws on Lithuanian Official Language, Flag, Anthem

18000324c Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
19 Nov 88 p 1

[Text] The LiSSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To supplement the LiSSR Constitution (Basic Law) with article 77¹ of the following content:

"Article 77¹. The official language of the LiSSR is Lithuanian.

"The LiSSR provides for the use of Lithuanian in the activity of state and public organizations, in the sphere of public education, culture, science and production and in other establishments, at enterprises and in organizations. The state displays concern for the all-around development of Lithuanian and the teaching of Lithuanian. Conditions will be created for the development of the other languages employed in the LiSSR also and for the assimilation of Russian and its use as the medium of inter-nation communication of the USSR peoples."

2. To instruct the LiSSR Council of Ministers to adopt the necessary measures pertaining to implementation of this law. Chairman of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium,

V. Astrauskas
Secretary of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium,
Y. Guretskas
Vilnius, 18 November 1988.

The LiSSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

To set forth articles 168 and 169 of the LiSSR Constitution as follows:

Article 168. The state flag of the LiSSR is the national flag, which represents a length of cloth consisting of three

equal horizontal colored bands: the upper, yellow, middle, green, and lower, red.

Article 169. The national anthem of the LiSSR is the "National Song" of V. Kudirka. Chairman of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium,
V. Astrauskas
Secretary of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium,
Y. Guretskas
Vilnius, 18 November 1988.

Klikunene Speech on Official Lithuanian Language, Symbols

*18000324d Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
19 Nov 88 pp 1-2*

[Report of Deputy V. Klikunene, deputy chairman of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium: "Addition to the LiSSR Constitution of a Provision Regulating the Official Status of Lithuanian and the Change in National Symbols of the LiSSR"]

[Text] The restructuring under way in our society and the ideas of regeneration have brought forward many topical problems of social and cultural life. One of the most important is the use of Lithuanian in the republic under the conditions of bilingualism and the state of Lithuanian.

The principles of the Soviet state's nationality policy were formulated by V.I. Lenin. Great attention is paid in his works to the national languages and their equality, use in the life of the state and unlimited development. "Ensuring a language for the local population in a state respect" is essential, V.I. Lenin maintained. He pointed out that "we need to introduce the strictest rules concerning the use of the national language in the non-Russian republics which are a part of our union and verify these rules particularly carefully. A detailed code, which may be compiled in any way successfully only by nationals living in a given republic, is needed here."

Lenin's principles of nationality policy were developed at the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Its resolution "Inter-Nation Relations" points out: "To display greater concern for the active functioning of the national languages in various spheres of state, social and cultural life. To encourage study of the language of the people after which the republic is named by citizens of other nationalities, primarily children and young people, residing on its territory." It is essential to create the conditions for the fulfillment of this instruction and move in this direction charted by the party.

Lithuanian is one of the oldest Indo-European languages. It has preserved its old phonetics and many morphological singularities. It is of great significance for scholarship, particularly linguistics and history. Lithuanian is studied by students of various universities of our country and is being or has been taught as a subject of linguistics in many of the world's universities.

We know from history how difficult Lithuanian's path has been in present times. The decades of press prohibition were particularly difficult for it. It was, naturally, unable to function freely and grow together with the self-awareness and intellect of the people. Even now it is still difficult for it in science, politics and other spheres of social activity.

The native language is the main characteristic of each people, expression of their distinctiveness and greatest treasure house of culture. For a people to survive, the language has to be preserved primarily. A great deal of work has been done by our scholars in researching Lithuanian and displaying concern to perfect it and foster speech standards. We thank them for this. However, the reality of our life has created an unpropitious situation for Lithuanian. First, the sphere of usage of Lithuanian has begun to narrow. Lithuanian is being supplanted in many spheres of the life of society. This is an insult to Lithuanians' national self-respect and weakens the ties of friendship of the peoples. Without an opportunity to converse in his native language in his own parts, a person begins to feel himself a stranger in his own home. Second, the language is becoming increasingly distorted, and the internal erosion of its vocabulary and grammatical structure is already far gone. Concern has arisen in society at the state of Lithuanian. The workforce, its party organizations, the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroika, the youth, scientists, writers and public figures began to submit proposals concerning the granting to Lithuanian of the status of official language and the creation for it in this way of natural conditions of functioning and development. The republic Supreme Soviet Presidium and the press, radio and television have received many letters on this question.

The organizational commission of the language festival conducted in Shyaulyay addressed to the LiSSR Supreme Soviet an insistent appeal for a "real evaluation of the continually deteriorating situation of Lithuanian and the adoption of measures to prevent this deformation of Lenin's nationality policy."

Many such proposals were received. Scholars of Vilnius University, the Academy of Sciences and various research institutes, workers of the Vilnius Radio Components and "Elfa" plants, the Lentvaris Carpet Factory and other enterprises and production associations, school and cultural establishment outfits and individuals wrote about this.

As the press reported, the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium decree "The Status of Lithuanian," which offered a draft addition to the constitution concerning an official language, was adopted on 6 October of this year. The Presidium received various proposals in connection with the wording of this addition. This draft was approved by the Lithuanian Language Commission under the auspices of the LiSSR Academy of Sciences and many outfits and public organizations. The wording

of the addition to the constitution was fully approved by a general public party meeting of the republic's artistic unions.

Proposals concerning a change in the wording have been received. For example, it is proposed merely indicating that the official language of the LiSSR is Lithuanian, while the use of other languages in the republic could be regulated by laws.

But there are people of a different opinion. Some workers of the Vilnius "Komunaras," 40-letiya Oktyabrya Tool-Building and Arc Welding Equipment plants, the Klaypeda "Baltiya" Shipyard and Western Ship-Repair Enterprise, the commercial and fishing ports, the fleet and of certain other outfits propose that official status be accorded not only Lithuanian but also Russian. Apprehension that the bilingualism of Lithuanian and Russian will not be observed and that the languages employed in the republic will not be capable of functioning equally is being expressed. This apprehension is groundless. The official status of Lithuanian does not limit the use of other languages, it will merely help us avoid uncontrolled bilingualism and an unwarranted confusion of languages.

Letters have been received which express the thought that in Vilnius and Shalchininkskiy, Shvenchenskiy and Trakayskiy rayons Polish could have the status of official language also.

"Venibe," the Socialist Movement for Perestroyka in Lithuania, "Unity," "Yednost" and the Russian Cultural Center have proposed at this session of the Supreme Soviet that the question of an official language not be discussed. Many deputies have submitted various proposals during the session. I will not comment on their opinion since the deputies may avail themselves of the session rostrum.

We should understand correctly the desire of the representatives of Russian, Polish and other peoples living in Lithuania to develop their national distinctiveness, culture and customs and the possibility of using their native language. People of different nationalities have down the ages lived amicably in Lithuania, worked together, rejoiced and suffered together and struggled together for a better life. There is no doubt that we will continue to adhere to such traditions.

However, it should be said that Lithuanians have no other land, no other region in which they could survive as a nation. Here, in Lithuania, are the roots of the Lithuanian people going back to the depths of the millennia, only here, in Lithuania, can we pass on to future generations our language, customs and national philosophy.

The current situation should be correctly understood by the representatives of other peoples. The status of Lithuanian will not infringe anyone's rights. The draft

amendment to the constitution clearly says: "Conditions will be created for the development of the other languages used in the LiSSR also and for the assimilation of Russian and its use as the medium of inter-nation communication of the USSR peoples." So the right both to the free study and use in Lithuania of the languages of other peoples is secured. This right is realized by specific measures. Kindergarten and schools which teach in Russian and Polish are in operation. These languages are employed in vocational-technical schools, secondary technical schools and VUZes. Newspapers and journals are published in these languages, and conditions are created for the establishment and activity of national organizations. As all walks of life are further democratized and reforms of the political system are implemented, the conditions of the development of the national cultures of different peoples will undoubtedly improve and ways of satisfying legitimate national requirements will be found.

The need to accord Lithuanian official status is understood also by people of other nationalities who really adhere to international views. The world-renowned Baltic scholar Vladimir Toporov recently wrote on this question in KOMYAUNIMO TIYESY.

It is impossible and inexpedient to set forth in detail in an article of the constitution questions of the use of the official language and other languages. This will be specifically regulated by a legislative instrument, the draft of which has been prepared by a commission set up by the Council of Ministers. The Standing Commission on National Relations and International Education and other commissions of the republic discussed the drafts of the addition to the constitution and the Presidium edict on the use of languages and approved them. The drafts of these documents have been handed to the deputies. We propose submitting the draft instrument regulating the use of languages for public discussion.

The essence of the use of languages will amount to the fact that Lithuanian should be used in the activity of all state and public bodies, in the field of education, culture, science, production, service and other fields and at enterprises and in establishments and organizations. Considering the conditions of our republic and the multinational composition of the population, the leaders of state bodies, public organizations and establishments and enterprises and also people working in services should know Lithuanian and Russian and serve inhabitants in these languages. Thus harmonious, purposively controlled bilingualism will create for Lithuanians and representatives of other peoples the conditions conducive to communication and the settlement of their business.

During the discussion of questions of the use of languages we have been unable to avoid intense emotions and ill-considered utterances. Disrespectful and sometimes hostile and provocative conduct even is encountered in everyday life, in services particularly: there is a

refusal to speak Russian or Lithuanian, and insults are heard. Such thrusts are encountered in the stores, on transport and in health service establishments. Only uncouth and civically immature people can behave thus. In this way they demean not only others but themselves also. Members of the Supreme Soviet, workforce leaders, public organizations and all citizens must resolutely combat such phenomena. We need to try to explain to everyone that the state regulation of the use of languages is necessary for the democratization of the life of society and for ensuring that the legitimate interests of the Lithuanian and other peoples living in the republic are not violated. The breeding and moral worth of each people and individual are, after all, also judged by their attitude toward other peoples. By their ability to deal with people of other nationalities in benevolent, patient and friendly manner. Cohesion and unity are needed particularly in the difficult period of perestroika.

In order that we might realize the official status of Lithuanian it is essential to develop Lithuanian studies. Although much has been done in the sphere of Lithuanian linguistics, literary history and folklore, it is necessary today to step up efforts considerably and expand research and publishing activity. It is necessary to conduct the preparation of the academic "Dictionary of Lithuanian," "Lithuanian Folk Songbook," "Atlas of the Lithuanian Language" and other publications more effectively. There is a shortage of researchers in the Academy of Sciences and the VUZes for this.

It is important to considerably improve the physical plant of Lithuanian research—to provide the establishments performing this work with the necessary materials and modern equipment. These measures are associated, of course, with additional spending. However, the development of Lithuanian studies is a vitally important task of our culture. We need for this reason to find opportunities for an increase in appropriations for these needs.

With the proclamation of Lithuanian as the official language its social prestige and positions in the life of the state and society will be consolidated and conditions conducive to its development will emerge. However, official status alone cannot appreciably improve either the condition of the language or the standards of speech of society. It is essential to perform a great deal of work on streamlining and developing the language.

It is important to create and introduce a uniform system of teaching of the language encompassing all levels—from the kindergarten through the higher school.

It is necessary in the departments to consistently display concern for the development of the language in one's own field and its standards. A system of observance of the official language encompassing all spheres of the use of language—public inscriptions, clerical work, the media and scholarly and other literature.

The public expects more standard works on the language, phrase books, dictionaries and primers which are published promptly in editions corresponding to requirements. We must create for people of other nationalities the most propitious conditions for study of Lithuanian.

Work on streamlining and developing the language by joint efforts should be performed by the state authorities, science and culture establishments, the school and society.

Proclaiming Lithuanian the official language of Soviet Lithuania means protecting the basis of the republic's culture and means realizing the sovereign right of the people constituting four-fifths of the population of the republic.

I propose that the LiSSR Constitution be supplemented with an article in accordance with the bill submitted by the members and that the status of official language of the LiSSR be imparted to Lithuanian.

I would like at this session to express to you and all people of the republic watching the television relay certain thoughts on an issue exciting the majority of us—on the state flag, national anthem and national emblem.

Prolonged discussion of national symbols is increasing tension and exciting people's minds and hearts since noble ideals, cherished aspirations and a bright future are linked with national attributes.

The tricolor, which appeared this year in places on the eve of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, was flying in mass numbers at the meeting with delegates thereto held in Vingis Park. A sea of yellow, green and red had soon filled up all of Lithuania.

On 7 October, USSR Constitution Day, the national flag was raised on the tower of Gediminas Castle. Shortly after it was flying on the dome of the ancient Trakay Castle and in many cities, communities and villages of the republic, and at this time, around the Supreme Soviet building.

At all the mass activities—in Gediminas Square and Vingis Park, in the vicinity of Ignalina and on the Baltic seashore—there has been solemnly heard repeatedly the old "National Song" of Vintasas Kudirka expressing noble human ideals, love for the motherland and a belief in its future. I would like to remind the deputies that the "National Song" was the republic's national anthem up to 1950.

A significant place among the symbols is occupied by the sign of Vitis, which has come down to us from the Middle Ages. The national flag, anthem and emblem together with regional symbols are a valuable part of the cultural heritage reflecting the self-expression, spirituality and noble ideals of the Lithuanian people.

This summer and fall, as you, dear deputies, have seen for yourselves, the political assertiveness of society has assumed unprecedented proportions. In the course of concerned and high-minded discussion of specific aspects of the political reform of the country and the republic the workforce, research establishments, creative organizations and individual citizens are expressing different, at times, contradictory opinions about establishing the national symbols as official symbols also. Discussion on this topic has been conducted repeatedly at sessions of the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium and at other levels. On the eve of the session the majority of deputies met with their electorate, and it expressed its opinion on these matters and formulated demands. The proposals are truly contradictory.

With regard for the opinion of the public and the proposals which have been received, the following versions of a solution of this problem arise:

First, recognizing as the state flag of the LiSSR the national yellow-green-red flag. Confirming as the national anthem the "National Song" of Vintasas Kudirka.

In connection with the discussion of the question of the LiSSR Constitution a Supreme Soviet commission to prepare a draft basic law of the republic should be set up. The opinion exists that this commission could competently analyze and decide the question of the national emblem.

The second possibility is continuing the discussion on the state flag, national anthem and national emblem of the republic and deciding these matters later, together with the new LiSSR Constitution.

Dear members, I propose that you express your opinion on these important matters.

Draft Ukase on Use of Lithuanian, Other Languages

*18000324e Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
19 Nov 88 p 2*

[Unattributed report entitled: "Ukase of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on the Use of the Lithuanian and Other Languages"]

[Text]The LiSSR Constitution legalizes Lithuanian as the official language.

For the purpose of ensuring the development and functioning of Lithuanian in state and social life without infringement here of the constitutional right of the foreign language-speaking population to use its native language and also Russian as the medium of communication of the USSR peoples the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium resolves:

1. To establish that Lithuanian as the official language is the most important medium of communication of the

population of the republic. It is to be used in the activity of the state and public authorities, in the field of public education, culture and science, in production activity and in services and social life and also at enterprises and in establishments and organizations.

For communication with the foreign language-speaking population in the LiSSR Russian will be used also, and in certain cases, other languages. Russian is also the most important medium of liaison with other union republics and departments of the USSR.

The languages of all the nationalities resident on the territory of the LiSSR are used as a medium of communication between them and also in the sphere of public education and culture.

For communicating with representatives of foreign countries foreign languages are used also.

2. The highest organs of state power and administration of the LiSSR, ministries, state committees, departments soviet ispolkoms, public organizations, enterprises, establishments and other organizations perform clerical work in the official language.

Enterprises, establishments and organizations in which internal clerical work has hitherto been performed in Russian will switch to clerical work in Lithuanian gradually, in accordance with the procedure determined by the LiSSR Council of Ministers.

They must ensure for organizations and the citizens an opportunity to use, settle issues and obtain documents in Lithuanian.

3. Correspondence between organs of state power and administration of the LiSSR and all departments, public organizations, enterprises, establishments and other organizations is conducted in the official language.

Correspondence with organs of state power and administration, departments, public organizations, enterprises, establishments and other organizations outside of the LiSSR is conducted in Russian or another language.

Each citizen has the right to appeal to any organization of the republic, settle issues and obtain an answer in Lithuanian or Russian (in whichever the appeal was lodged).

4. The laws of the LiSSR, enactments of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium and decrees and injunctions of the LiSSR Council of Ministers are issued in Lithuanian and Russian.

Legislative instruments and other documents of ministries, state committees, departments, enterprises, establishments and organizations are issued in Lithuanian, and where necessary, in Lithuanian and Russian.

5. Inscriptions in the official language are obligatory on all seals, stamps and clerical record forms and signboards and also on office premises and products manufactured in the republic.

6. To establish that the leaders and other executives of the highest organs of state power and administration of the LiSSR, ministries, state committees, departments, soviet ispolkoms, public organizations, enterprises, establishments and other organizations must know Lithuanian and Russian. The leaders of people's courts, state notary offices, procuracy and internal affairs authorities, health care, social security, trading, service, transport, communications, finance and housing establishments and also of other establishments in constant contact with the public ensure that the people serving the public can make themselves understood to the citizens and serve them in Lithuanian and Russian.

7. Activities (congresses, sessions, meetings, sittings, colloquia and so forth) organized in the republic are conducted in Lithuanian. Persons who do not know Lithuanian have the right to use Russian. In such cases the organizers of the activities provide a translation.

8. Conditions must be created for residents of the LiSSR for study of Lithuanian and for acquiring in Lithuanian general secondary, secondary specialized and higher education. For ensuring the active participation of the foreign language-speaking population in the state, social and cultural life of the republic Lithuanian must be taught in non-Lithuanian educational institutions.

9. As it wishes, children's preschool establishments and high schools will be created for the foreign language-speaking population of the republic or lessons will be conducted in the native language, and conditions will be created for the organization of language and culture societies, clubs, museums, theaters and ensembles and also for the publication of books and newspapers.

Russian or another language may be used in interrepublic educational institutions and non-Lithuanian children's preschool establishments, schools and cultural establishments for communication and internal clerical work. However, they must have people working there who are able to communicate and conduct correspondence in the official language.

10. The state authorities of the LiSSR are obliged to ensure the prestige of correct Lithuanian, the preservation of Lithuanian given and surnames and placenames, all-around assistance to Lithuanian language institutes and the creation of the physical plant necessary for the development, study and expansion of its functions. It is necessary together with this to create the conditions for the development of the culture of the other languages employed in the republic.

Supsov Members Discuss LiSSR Constitution Amendments

18000324f Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
25 Nov 88 pp 2-3

[Text]

Speech of Deputy Yu. Martsinkyavichyus

We have discussed and approved the plan of the republic's economic development and confirmed the budget. These are undoubtedly important issues, and our attention to them confirms this. However, the question which we are discussing now is in terms of its significance beyond comparison and cannot be measured and evaluated by any budgets: we are speaking of the greatest resource of the people, of their most exalted creation, we are speaking of the language, of the home of our heart and thoughts, and we wish to surround it with protection and concern, consolidate in law the foundations of this home, show light in the windows and patch up the roof. History would never forgive us if we failed to do this, if we failed to avail ourselves of our innate and constitutional right. This would be tantamount to us permitting the destruction of the Athens Acropolis. The world would condemn us were we to fail to protect against day-to-day erosion our ancient language, of infinite importance to scholarship, were we to allow this resource to decline, become overgrown with weeds and to decay.

The illustrious creator of our written language, Mikolajus Dauksa, wrote back in 1599 in the preface to his "Postil": "It is not by the fertility of the soil, not by the diversity of dress, not by the beauty of the land and not by the strength of the cities and castles that people live but, most of all, by preserving and utilizing their language." We hear in these words, possibly, the most telling idea of the European Renaissance and sympathize with it since we understand that a people's individuality and its life are manifested most through language. It may be maintained that language makes us brothers and confirms and extends our presence in history and culture and that without a language national self-expression and creativity are impossible.

An infinitely dramatic fate has befallen Lithuanian, through which have rolled centuries of Germanization, Polonization and Russification, which diluted, eroded and bore away forever Lithuania Minor and the other southeastern provinces of ethnic Lithuania. The entire history of our region has been imbued with continuous concern for the language and our entire culture has been and continues to be keenly aware of its civic duty to stand guard at the threshold of the native language. It is now our turn to mount this vigil.

A highly paradoxical situation has emerged in the republic since the war: linguistics has developed rapidly, acquiring all-union and world renown, Vilnius has become a center of Baltic studies, the "Large Dictionary

of the Lithuanian Language" is published here, substantial dialect studies, grammars and dictionaries are published and rules of the literary language are being devised. This affords us justifiable satisfaction. However, we see that Lithuanian is being supplanted in the republic's state and party life and disappearing catastrophically from the documents and correspondence of ministries, departments and plants and from the sphere of transport, service, health care, communications and elsewhere. The corresponding personnel policy has accompanied and continues to accompany the expansion of the union and central departments in Lithuania. Take, for example, the Klaypeda Western Ship-Repair Yard, at which all executive positions are held by non-Lithuanians. The general director, party committee secretary, chief of the Personnel Department, union committee chairman, Komsomol committee secretary and many others are non-Lithuanians and do not know Lithuanian. The yard does not even have a typewriter with a Lithuanian typeface. A worker of this yard, the communist V. Bivilis, concludes his letter to TIYESA with the words: "It is an insult when it is impossible to speak in one's own parts in the native tongue."

It is, indeed. The more so in that the Klaypeda Western Ship-Repair Yard is very reminiscent of the military "northwest region". Just look at the name. It is far from the only one. My information is possibly mistaken (I very much wish that it were so), but in Vilnius, say, the capital of the LiSSR, of all the plants, only the Drill Plant keeps all its records in Lithuanian. How and why is it that the principal language of the republic, which 80 percent of its inhabitants speak, has in practice been virtually displaced from the sphere of production management and from soviet and party establishments? Why did the Gosplan and the former Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education not plan and train, say, specialists in nuclear engineering or ship building and repair? Are Lithuanians not up to these sciences, perhaps? I wish to remain calm, but, nonetheless, I have to say that we ourselves frequently drag Lithuanian down, into a hole, and that, paraphrasing Mayakovskiy, are ourselves at its throat, endeavoring to please, be liked and demonstrate imaginary internationalism. This is frequently merely careerist internationalism. The time has come to call this showcase, aggressive and demagogic "internationalism," if you'll excuse the expression, out-and-out careerism and an ideological lie. Such "internationalism" should be identified, put to shame and condemned—both in Vilnius and Moscow. In my view, the Russian should be repelled by such behavior on the part of a Lithuanian for any subservience, linguistic included, is incompatible with human dignity and is a sign of low breeding and servitude.

In according Lithuanian the status of official language we are thereby making it incumbent upon him to be sensitive and tolerant, well-bred and patient toward the languages of the other peoples living in the republic. Lithuanian will not become more beautiful, richer, more resonant and more dignified if we do not respond to a

question put not in Lithuanian, demonstratively turning aside or offending by a bad or insulting word. Yes, our language has experienced many insults and injustice and has suffered from discrimination. It is now returning from exile, as it were, restoring to it what was taken away from it, what has belonged to it since time immemorial and by constitutional right. But let our language be noble and magnanimous and use its legislative power only when it has encountered the deliberate, malicious flouting of its right of official language. The oldest in the family of Indo-European languages, Lithuanian is obliged to remain dignified and just. Only thus will it and those who speak it merit both respect and glory.

In according, more precisely, possibly, restoring to Lithuanian the status of official language we must be imbued with a resolve to protect its purity, rid it, and thereby ourselves also, of every conceivable obstruction, multiply its riches and, what is most important, pass it on like daily bread to future generations. I appeal to parents and teachers and writers and linguists to serve the language with all their might and help it get itself straight. A restored and free language should lead us to the great freedom of the creation of culture and should ensure for the people the fuller sovereignty of spiritual culture.

I propose confirmation of Lithuanian as the official language of the LiSSR and the addition of the corresponding article to the LiSSR Constitution.

I propose that the session confirm our national flag as the state flag of the LiSSR. The Lithuanian people marched with this flag through their contemporary history—through the historic events of 1918-1940, in 1939 it was hoisted on the tower of Gediminas Castle, in July 1944 it once again soared over liberated Vilnius and in 1945, following the liberation of the whole territory of Lithuania, it was raised in Klaypeda. It is a flag which the whole Lithuanian people consider their own. Nor was it ever banned. It would unite and rally people for labor, creativity and life.

I propose that the session confirm the "National Song" of V. Kudirka the anthem of the LiSSR. The present anthem, which is not sung, is a typical work of the era of Stalinism, very unimportant and therefore alien to our musical and poetical tradition and unloved by the people.

The "National Song" of V. Kudirka is undoubtedly a grand work. The ideas expressed in it are noble and humane, and its invocatory music is stirring. And, what is most important, it is a popular song performed by the whole people, performed with tears in their eyes. Wherever else in the world is an anthem sung with such emotional uplift?

I propose confirmation of the national flag as our state flag, and the "National Song," our national anthem, and that the corresponding entries be made to the LiSSR Constitution.

I propose that Vitis, who has accompanied the Lithuanian people since the time of formation of statehood through our day, be confirmed as the emblem of the LiSSR. Vitis participated in the Volhynia Pact in 1219 even. Vitis fought at Zhalgiris and in other battles which determined the fate of the Lithuanian people. At the time of the common Lithuanian-Polish state—the *Rech Pospolita*—Vitis defended the people's sovereignty. He symbolized the people's revived statehood in 1918.

Speech of Deputy A.Yu. Yuozenas-Baltushis

I am infinitely happy that I have lived to see this day and have the honor of taking part in a session of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet which will undoubtedly become a firm part of the history of Lithuania and play, thanks to the decrees, a tremendous part in the preservation of the durability of our people and in securing their further strengthening and all-around development.

Our native language should and will today be returned to the Lithuanian people, who gave it birth, shaped it and preserved it for many centuries under the thatched roof of each Lithuanian and in the ardently burning heart of the brightest and noblest of their sons and daughters. The people carried their native language through all adversities and severe trials and passed it on to us, making it religiously incumbent upon us to preserve it and pass it on to future generations as the dearest legacy and basis of life and prosperity.

The eyes of all of Lithuania are on us today. All Lithuanians, scattered by the storms of history in remote parts overseas and the snows of Siberia, whence not all have yet returned, are looking to us. Men of scholarship of the world's top universities studying one of the oldest and richest languages of the world—our Lithuanian!—are waiting for us to perform this sacred duty and the boost which we will by our resolutions give the further growth, strengthening and development of the Lithuanian people.

This is a historic hour, a historic test for everyone.

We have assembled today not in Stockholm, not in Geneva, not in Paris, not in Washington and not in some other place of the five continents of our planet. We are at home. In the ancient capital of Lithuania—Vilnius—in the residence of the government of the Lithuanian state. And we have gathered as the representatives of all nationalities living in the republic. For this reason today, righting the consequences of the cruel and perdition-threatening insult to the Lithuanian people, we must be as candid as can be and speak the whole truth, however unpleasant.

Contrary to the assertions of the propaganda of the times of the Stalin business and the Brezhnev stagnation concerning the flourishing and blossoming handsome flower of the equality of all Soviet peoples and the friendship of the peoples unclouded by any misunderstandings, our native language has in recent decades

been systematically squeezed into the position of an outcast. Its teaching in the schools has declined from year to year, and its use been limited increasingly in Lithuania's social life and in many republic establishments, at industrial enterprises primarily. It has become impossible for the Lithuanian to converse in Lithuanian, which is ignored and frequently derided. It is sufficient for some executive or other to come from the center for congresses, conferences and plenums to be conducted only in Russian. An unprecedented obstruction of Lithuanian with barbarisms and its impoverishment have begun in everyday use, and it has become increasingly faded and gray. We can only remember in what sumptuous, beautiful language K. Donelaitis, S. Daukantas, Maironis, Vayzhgantas, V. Mikolaitis-Putinas, B. Sruoga, S. Neris and P. Tsvirka wrote their works! Where is it now, this language? I could weep from such a bitter loss! As a writer, I have for 50 years been looking throughout Lithuania for a typewriter with a Lithuanian typeface. And I, an old man, a communist, a member of the Supreme Soviet, am today forced to cringe before the private trader-profitteer and beseech him to change the font on the typewriter, which is sold only with a Russian keyboard. I did not experience such humiliation even in bourgeois-administered Lithuania! But now, when we are living in a family of equal and free fraternal Soviet peoples? Who am I! Not one state establishment of Lithuania, not one school or VUZ, kolkhoz or sovkhoz—all are forced to cringe and beseech some offices or pushers or other!

I speak plainly and openly: if we do not today adopt and confirm the supplementary provision of the LiSSR Constitution regulating the official status of Lithuanian, the uncontrollable death pangs and disappearance of the native language will begin very soon. And if we allow our language to disappear, we ourselves as a people will also disappear from the face of the Earth. To live or disappear—this is the question which arises at this historic hour!

Our entire people know and understand this. The broadest strata of the Lithuanian people, to whom the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroyka has called for national revival, are living this concern. It is sufficient to go out of this building to see this for oneself. We do not have the moral right to leave this historic session without the official status of Lithuanian in our hands and in our hearts!

This patriotic upsurge of our entire people and their unbending will have evoked in people of certain other nationalities living in the republic feelings of mistrust, alarm and fear even: this misunderstanding or the other and discriminatory action even may arise with the affirmation of the official status of Lithuanian. These people need to be correctly understood. They are the victims of Stalin's cult and Brezhnev's stagnation—times which poisoned people's minds. It is our duty to sincerely and patiently help them understand everything correctly.

For my part, I wish to say frankly: "Our dear brothers and sisters, unbowed inhabitants of Lithuania, all with whom we live as a common family under Lithuanian

skies. Be in no hurry, be in no hurry to prematurely give yourselves the martyr's crown! Your alarm, fear and apprehension concerning possible discrimination are devoid of all real grounds. Analyze our history calmly, without prejudice. In no past century will you find instances of Lithuanians discriminating against Russians or Poles, Karaims or Tatars or peoples of other nationalities living in Lithuania. There have been no such instances, there are none today, there will be none. We love our homeland ardently, treasure our language and sacredly revere the family hearth and the graves of our forefathers and are at the same time by nature internationalists. The Lithuanian has never aspired to lecture other peoples of the world, impose on them his way of life and dictate his will. The Lithuanian himself for many centuries learned from other peoples. This is why we are so sincerely pleased that the Russians living in Lithuania have their own theater, that newspapers, journals and books are published in their native language, that dozens of schools which teach in Russian and Polish operate in the republic, that Jewish people, who experienced the terrible tragedy of Hitler extermination, are creating in Vilnius centers of national culture and that the national self-awareness of the Karaims, Tatars and other national minorities is being revived on our land. Patience, mutual respect and fraternal assistance to each person who has experienced trouble—this is what is dearest of all to us Lithuanians!"

And this is why I sincerely and ardently call on everyone, regardless of nationality, social position or other differences, to vote unanimously for the official status of Lithuanian, the tricolor state flag and national anthem, the national emblem, the genuine friendship and national prosperity of all peoples living in Lithuania and our common happiness and well-being!

Speech of Deputy A. Grishin

There is no need to say how complex the question we are currently discussing is. Nonetheless, I would like to express my thoughts and observations.

For several months the media have been keeping us very thoroughly informed on this question. Various viewpoints have been expressed. The proposition that Lithuanian is the official language I find absolutely correct and indisputable. I would note in passing that any language, Lithuanian too, of course, performs not only a communicative function, that is, the function of intercourse, but is a vector of spiritual, moral and aesthetic values.

At the same time I believe that an official language, I refer to Lithuanian, performs three functions: it functions in legal proceedings, clerical work and in the sphere of culture, science and education. This is, of course, a positive fact permitting the all-around development of the life of all of the LiSSR.

It needs to be considered that approximately 70 other nationalities constituting 20 percent of the population live on the territory of the LiSSR. True, there are among these 70 nationalities two which stand out—Russians

and Poles. I say this to show that if constitutional rights are not reserved for Russian and Polish, the danger of their infringement and at the same time extinction will arise.

This is why I wish to associate myself with the resolution of the working group of the Russian Cultural Center and request its inclusion as a separate clause in the draft law. It reads thus: "The official language of the LiSSR is Lithuanian.

"The LiSSR provides for the use of the Lithuanian language and writing in clerical work (in state and public bodies), legal proceedings and the spheres of education, culture and science. The state displays concern for the all-around development of Lithuanian and its teaching. The state provides for the free use of Russian and Polish in the sphere of education, culture and science. Conditions will be created for the development also of other languages employed in the LiSSR, and the use of Russian as the medium of inter-nation communication of the USSR peoples when citizens address state and public bodies and organizations is guaranteed. The sphere of the free use of different languages of the population of the republic guaranteed by the state is additionally established by the law on the official language of the LiSSR."

Comrades, inasmuch as prior to the session itself an amendment was made to my speech concerning national attributes, that is, use of the flag, emblem and anthem, I wish to say the following. I expressed my viewpoint at the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium session and will briefly confirm it. I believe that national symbols and attributes, as an expression of the unity of spirit and aspirations of the Lithuanian people and their pain, were unlawfully torn away and confiscated from the life of the Lithuanian people. You will today be active participants in the rectification of this historic error. Be worthy of this historic moment!

Speech of Deputy A. Brazaytis

The work of the present session is graphic proof that power is being transferred to the soviets. Even the LiSSR Supreme Soviet is having to deal with a rectification of political and ideological mistakes. Mistakes which the directive authorities made in the situation of a deformed state lacking the rule of law. It is particularly difficult to rectify mistakes in ideology since they are based on faith, and a decent man cannot change his faith daily.

It will perhaps be impossible in the course of this complex process of renovation to expunge the past from the memory and allow to be forgotten, for example, the want and indigence and the social injustice and illiteracy of independent Lithuania, its hopeless aspiration to unite the land, anticommunism inspired by class hatred, the tragedies of the war and the postwar years and the many other disasters to which not only certain historians

are closing their eyes today. In a human way I understand the desire of people, the young people particularly, when such a multitude of problems and troubles has accumulated here, to see in the past, perhaps, in history something good and bright. But it should be understood that our Lithuania has never been consummate and united, although the national anthem has for many years called for such unity. This can be seen distinctly now, when society, shaken by the crimes of the Stalin business, is looking for a way out of the veritable crisis situation, which is being exacerbated by the ever growing wave of the most extreme opinions and gloating criticism. The most difficult thing in this volcanic eruption is to preserve the social benefits which have been won and our unity. This problem has arisen as a most acute danger for perestroika. We have understood that there are supporters and enemies of the policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, that there are active fighters and opponents. There are forces which are straining forward and there are forces inclined only to destroy and wipe out and calling for revenge. A conflict is arising between actual possibilities and a kind of derangement of the mind, which was noticed first among the intellectuals and publicly expressed by Jonas Avizhyus at a meeting of communists of the artistic unions. This situation of which I speak may be sensed not from overseas voices, as before. The alarm now is being caused by the speeches of our people who have lost a sense of political reality.

But what can be done.... I am not proposing that mouths be closed or ears stopped up in order that these voices might not be heard, as we did formerly. The less so in that the celebration of the October anniversary and the processes of recent days have shown that cooperation is possible. If even Reagan and Gorbachev can talk together, why should we ourselves not do this. The Stalinist slogan that one does not talk with one's enemies proclaimed by Yermalavichyus is totally unacceptable today. The more so in that only the prosecutor today knows who the enemy is.

The time has come for our government also to see life such as it is. And this is being done. Only we must not vainly bustle about and cannot be tolerant of a failure to comply with legislation and lose our balance, after all, having lost this balance, any organism, social particularly, geneticists believe, reproduces in its descendants pervert-mutants. Judging by the composed position of Comrade Vitautas Sakalauskas displayed at the government television forum, this will in all likelihood not happen in Soviet Lithuania. The problems of present and future need to be approached with great responsibility. They exist in politics, and this is what is most important. After all, the party and the Soviet Government are being branded mercilessly for a failure to fulfill promises and for the excessive burden of the centralized economy and culture heaped on their shoulders. Therefore let us now, without pondering too long what kind of burden this should be, practicably evaluate the powers of our republic. We will at this session enact a law proclaiming Lithuanian the official language in Lithuania.

This is so elementary, but pleasant since we recognize ourselves as dignified, equal citizens deserving of respect. Only we should not utter these words too proudly nor make a celebration out of what should be routine. We need to understand that a sense of alarm has emerged in relations between people, that people of other nationalities feel uneasy and that the first painful conflicts are arising. In the deteriorating situation each citizen, the Lithuanian primarily, is obliged to render assistance. Only in an atmosphere of the peaceful coexistence of the languages and peoples can both our language and our nation flourish. Let us not be passive in relation to the native language and let us understand that whoever we are—Lithuanians, Poles, Russians, Jews or representatives of other nationalities—we must never in a civilized age attempt to impose our culture and language on others if they themselves do not come to this naturally, out of a feeling of respect. Have we not seen this for ourselves from the bitter experience of Russian-language policy?

Let us learn from mistakes and listen to the quite smart arguments of our adversaries. Deciding the question of the opening of special library collections, I was recently reading the works of Antanas Smetona and Augustinas Voldemaras and their published speeches. I do not pretend that I was not amazed that even these adroit masters of the manipulation of national feelings understood what dangers arise given a flareup of national conflicts.

So what can be said about us citizens of socialist Lithuania, people to whom a feeling of internationalism should be no stranger and whom history and life have taught much.

In enacting the law on Lithuanian we today condemn and repudiate careerist, dogmatic internationalism. I subscribe to the statement of Yustinas Martsinkavichyus that this is demeaning to dignity and gives rise to resistance. The nation's awakening is a reaction precisely to such internationalism. We must understand that there must not be and never again will be this past "internationalism". Testifying to this are both the CPSU Central Committee decision—to conduct a plenum on national relations—and our reaction to the draft amendments to the constitution. Only we should not get excited and support artificially inspired, intentionally nationalist attacks and political speculation on the situation which has taken shape thus far. In rectifying political mistakes we are truly straightening the way toward the peoples' self-respect, toward the true Leninist internationalism, of which there is no need to be ashamed.

Dear members, without dissociating ourselves from the national measures which are currently being implemented very frequently, let us curb their organizers who lack a sense of proportion. It is the absence of this sense of proportion which creates the danger of the emergence of a state of euphoria. This is, frankly speaking, a pleasant state for us Lithuanians. But we should understand that there is a danger when a person, in the

attainment of something pleasant, cannot keep control of himself and gravitates toward acute sensations. Besides, we need to think of others also. We need to know that a person stupified by alcohol, drugs or feelings run wild is not respected, not even tolerated. So let us not support befuddled people who have lost a sense of self-criticism.

The national narcotic and policy of ultimatums are particularly dangerous. This is the first step toward fanaticism and national discord, which have pushed more than one country to catastrophe. Such a situation preceded the orgy of Hitler's thugs and China's Red Guards, who carved up first of all the intelligentsia, and only then the bureaucrats, and also Khomeini's revolutionary guards and the murderers of Hungarian communists in 1956. Let us learn and strive to ensure that the dangerous social disease of phobia, which is characterized by a fear of being among people and which prompts them to extreme actions, not spread in our society. I say these words and believe that I am repeating the thoughts, already expressed repeatedly, of Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, and the thoughts of reasonable leaders of "Sayudis" and the clergy. But, I repeat, I wish to emphasize that fanatics are not, as history teaches, held back from irresponsible actions by either politicians, the clergy or the words of the most distinguished poets. The concerted actions of the community and the state, reasonable compromise and amnesties are needed to halt such a stream. It is therefore necessary to act before the destructive stream of confrontation gains momentum. First of all, we need to demand of the leaders of the state establishments and outfits being restructured and reorganized a strengthening of organization, discipline and order since without this we will achieve nothing and merely become entangled in even bigger muddles. But in the struggle for discipline we should not act as we acted several years ago, sending people's control officers and the members of public order squads into the cafes and movie theaters or police with nightsticks to the meeting on 28 September, without good reason. In conjunction with democratic means we must rally people for the cause and dissociate ourselves from those who, linking up with "Sayudis" and ignoring certain of its noble ideals, are conveniently taking up their positions on the platforms of opposition verbiage and endeavoring not by deed but with speeches to gain popularity. For them, who do not participate in practical work, it is better when everything becomes worse and more difficult. Man is only free when he observes order and the laws.

And now, comrades, to conclude my speech I wish to submit three proposals to the government in order not to be merely a deputy who goes on and on. The first is closely connected with proclamation of Lithuanian as the official language. It is elimination of the shortage of the printed word. The empty store shelves are depressing, but half-empty bookstores are no less dispiriting also. We need to instruct the Gosplan and the State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants and

Book Trade to draw up a long-term program of the elimination of this shortage. It would be good were the deputies, the intelligentsia primarily, who suffer from this shortage most, to familiarize themselves with it.

The second concerns the press. It is obvious that it has done an extraordinary amount, awakening the critical spirit and calling on society for perestroyka. But inertia is making itself felt and conflicts are intensifying even here. It is known that somewhere, in someone's cabin, a law on the press is being formulated. I declare with full responsibility that this work is being performed impermissibly slowly. The absence of a law is already giving rise not only to jokes on this subject but also very serious problems in the sphere of information and intensifying the anarchy and irresponsibility in this vitally important field of state and social life. Called to action from lofty platforms, people working in the mass media are ceasing to reckon with the rules currently in force and are, as they say, taking matters into their own hands. The rules of operation of the printing houses and duplicating divisions are largely being violated, and leaflets and veritable proclamations—publications of an inflammatory, provocative nature, and not only in respect of the authorities, what is more—are coming to be disseminated. Ever increasing pressure is being put on editorial offices for the publication of material containing state and military secrets. The right of the party to control processes in the press is being discussed openly and increasingly loudly. In addition, the control itself is visibly weakening. It is essential to draw conclusions from this and adopt decisions immediately. Not, of course, in support of methods of control of the press which have compromised themselves. The law on the press is called on to grant Soviet power the right of legislative regulation of relations in this sphere also and to preserve balance in matters of perestroyka.

Third, not only as a deputy but also as a member of the Journalists Union, I wish to support our union's ideas in connection with a reorganization of the newspapers. Only I propose that their implementation begin with Lithuania's main newspaper—TIYESA. With regard for the fact that we are proclaiming Lithuanian the official language we need to enhance in earnest the status of the republic's main newspaper. It should be the most authoritative in Lithuania, competently and professionally expressing the position of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee and the republic government. TIYESA should not be ashamed of this status and should orient itself toward other newspapers and journals which are noticeably ahead of it in keenness of polemic and sensation. The government is today at the center of public attention. I believe that in this situation it is obliged to have a dependable platform. This would be just and Leninist. It is necessary that, if only once a week, the paper be published in a large edition like VECHERNIYE NOVOSTI and LITERATURA IR MYANAS. It would then be able to enter into effective discussion with the opposition to the government, defend political positions of importance for perestroyka and disclose fully what

was being done in the sphere of activity of the authorities, relying not only on the dry and formal reports of ELTA or TASS.

TIYESA may be strengthened by eliminating the unpopular journals SOBYTIYA I VREMYA and TARIBU DARBAS. I fully approve the draft law on the Lithuanian language which has been submitted for examination and call for its enactment.

Speech of Deputy A. Lenkyavichyute

Just before the Supreme Soviet session I, as a deputy, received a mandate in the form of a letter containing a multitude of signatures which I would like today to read out:

"We welcome the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree of 6 October 1988 on the status of Lithuanian. We have waited a long time for this decree. The present attitude toward Lithuanian has led, for example, to Lithuanian being used at our plant, where Lithuanians constitute the vast majority of workers and the management is wholly Lithuanian, only in documents of the plant Sports Committee. True, we have begun to detect a certain improvement at the plant recently, in connection with the discussion of the position of Lithuanian which has begun in our society. Records have come to be filled in mainly in Lithuanian, and people are trying to speak and employ stress correctly. People of other nationalities are trying to speak Lithuanian. This is the result of many years of constant activity: the linguistic education of society is undertaken on television and radio, and Lithuanian is being studied in the republic's schools where the teaching is conducted in other languages. Some things are being done in this area in our plant also. Lithuanian language courses, which are attended with every passing year by an increasingly large number of people, have been operating for several years running now. All this is creating the propitious prerequisites for Lithuanian to become the official language. We believe that this decree will make an effective contribution to a further improvement in the position of Lithuanian.

"But we have discovered in the decree parts that are not entirely precisely worded also. We doubt primarily whether the proclamation of Lithuanian as the official language should be combined with an affirmation that conditions will be created for the use of Russian as the medium of inter-nation communication. In a bilingual situation Russian wins and will continue to win. For example, although in many republics of the Transcaucasus the local languages have been legalized as official languages and the free use of Russian is guaranteed at the same time, one has the impression that Russian is taking root there. The proposed wording of legalization of Lithuanian is reminiscent of the wording adopted in the republics of the Transcaucasus and does not protect the peoples against the influence of Russian. For this reason the proposed amendment to the USSR Constitution

concerning the use of Russian as the medium of inter-nation communication leaves a loophole for Russian to be interpreted by the foreign language-speaking population of Lithuania the same as the official language. For part of the Lithuanian population this affords an opportunity for managing without Lithuanian completely.

"We should communicate with the local Russian or local Pole in Lithuanian, although everyone knows Russian. Only thus will we strengthen the positions of Lithuanian. Why do we need a second language where one official language has been legalized. In our view, we need to consider as other USSR peoples those living outside of Lithuania, that is, the Russians of Russia, Ukrainians of the Ukraine and so forth. Therefore we propose that the part in question be worded as follows: to use Russian as the basic language for maintaining the federal relations of the USSR. This would make it possible to stress the principle of monolingualism which is vitally necessary for the Lithuanian people.

"Second, the concept of official languages is insufficiently clear to us. We read it thus: an official language means that universally in Lithuania dealings on all issues should be conducted in Lithuanian. For this it is necessary that the local foreign language-speaking population know Lithuanian. For this reason it is necessary to fundamentally improve in Russian and Polish schools, technical schools and groups of VUZ's the teaching of Lithuanian. We need to produce good primers, dictionaries and so forth. And ensure that they be constantly available. Meanwhile there is for those studying Lithuanian currently a particular shortage of Lithuanian-Russian and Lithuanian-Polish dictionaries. Clearly, in the initial period of introduction of the official Lithuanian language, until it has been learned by non-Lithuanians, Russian will be used, as now, in internal life. But subsequently, with the predominance of Lithuanian, Russian should be used only in external interpublic relations and also for communication with citizens of other republics, and not for supporting internal relations between different peoples in Lithuania. The nonindigenous inhabitant of Lithuania forced to learn and assimilate Lithuanian will feel a certain moral discomfort, but the Lithuanian forced to use Russian in Lithuania would step by step be pushed toward loss of nationality. The Lithuanian has no ethnographic territory other than Lithuania. This position should be understood by Lithuania's nonindigenous inhabitants, and they should agree to the introduction of the official Lithuanian language. We propose that the article on the official language in the constitution be worded as follows: the official language of the LiSSR is Lithuanian. The LiSSR provides for the use of Lithuanian in the activity of state and public bodies, in the sphere of public education, culture, science and production and in other establishments, at enterprises and in organizations. The state concerns itself with the all-around development of Lithuanian and the teaching of Lithuanian. Opportunities are created for the development of other languages

employed in the LiSSR also and for the assimilation of Russian and its use as the medium of maintaining the USSR's federal relations.

"To determine the use of the official Lithuanian language by a special legislative instrument which indicates, particularly: a) the need for the effective instruction of nonindigenous inhabitants in Lithuanian; b) the specific ways and timeframe of the transition to the official Lithuanian language. We request consideration of our wishes." A multitude of signatures....

I shall express my opinion also. I will vote for Lithuanian to be adopted as the official language. The foreign language-speaking population, which is afraid and unwilling even to learn Lithuanian, is hereby expressing, in my view, disrespect for both the language and the whole Lithuanian people. And I see no grain of reason in yesterday's pronouncements of Deputy D. Masyan from Shalchininkay that he has no time to learn Lithuanian. It is not time, I would say, which is lacking but desire. I judge from myself. When I arrived in Vilnius, I knew neither Russian nor Polish. But I learned and can now speak in any language, which does not stop me being a Lithuanian. I believe that it would not stop Russians, Poles, Jews and others being representatives of their peoples were they, living in Lithuania, to know Lithuanian also.

One more thing. While I am at the podium, I wish to say that I support the draft new LiSSR Constitution. I propose that everyone study the additions proposed by "Sayudis" and insert them in the draft LiSSR Constitution. As far as the changes and additions to the USSR Constitution are concerned, I say on behalf of my outfit "no".

Speech of Deputy G. Lyakhov

The question being discussed today is of significance in the future destiny of our republic.

I represent a multinational pilot outfit.

Recognition of Lithuanian as the official language is being correctly understood, as a whole, among the people working in aviation—people of various nationalities. The absence in the LiSSR Constitution of an article on language has led to insufficient attention having been paid to study of Lithuanian in many outfits, the pilot group included.

At the same time I should say that this problem is greatly troubling part of the republic's population—my electorate—since it is creating a certain strain in interethnic relations. This is a consequence of the fact that certain extremist persons are by their actions and also by ill-considered articles in the press or appearances on television frequently endeavoring to take advantage of the problem of Lithuanian to estrange people and infringe their legitimate interests and civil rights.

The version of the Official Language Law and also the "Use of Lithuanian and Other Languages" edict do not fully correspond to the spirit of the 19th Party Conference and the "Sayudis" program on the nationality issue.

In the event of their adoption in this version, the danger of part of the population being in practice unable to avail itself of many rights accorded them by the constitution will be created. I fully agree with recognition of Lithuanian as the official language. But it would seem to me that to safeguard the constitutional guarantees of the rights of citizens of non-Lithuanian nationality who have not yet mastered Lithuanian or who are incapable of mastering it it would be expedient to make to the proposed draft law an insertion of the following content. After the words: "...teaching of Lithuanian" to record: "The free use in the LiSSR in state and public bodies, organizations and cultural and educational establishments of Russian and other languages of the population is ensured. No privileges or restrictions on languages are allowed."

"The LiSSR provides for the study of Russian as the medium of inter-nation communication of the USSR peoples."

These amendments could be reflected in the "Use of Lithuanian and Other Languages" edict. I believe that such assurances should be enshrined constitutionally or set forth as a supplement to Comrade Grishin's version.

This amendment in no way infringes the status of Lithuanian as the official language.

I propose that the "Use of Lithuanian and Other Languages" edict be submitted for general discussion. The language problem is the whetstone on which inter-nation relations are honed.

I support the deputies who have spoken of the wisdom of the Lithuanian people and their ability to live amicably with people of all nationalities. The enactment of the law on the official Lithuanian language with our amendments and the submittal of the "Use of Lithuanian and Other Languages" edict for general discussion would, I believe, be approved by the Lithuanian people and the whole electorate.

I support the proposal concerning recognition of the national flag as the state flag, and as the anthem, the "National Song" of Kudirka.

Speech of Deputy Yu. Nekroshyus

It is currently a turbulent fall.

One cannot help but feel the cold wind which cuts through the young man carrying the slogan "Official Language Status for Lithuanian!" We all also feel a spiritual uplift, we feel the breath of history and hear its question: "How?"

You who are standing close by, troubled and still doubtful, what are you thinking about? Do you know, do you sense that for us Lithuanian means the grief of school computed in decades, the whips of the gendarmes, the sacrifices of the mobile library assistants, the first Lithuanian book, the treasure houses of songs, sayings and tales?

Do you know that the language which was preserved and defended for centuries, which lived through the times of splinters for light, was awoken by Kudirka's "Varpas" and finally found a voice gradually began to lose its civic spirit, dignity, purity and sovereignty? A language with its roots cut, although its cheeks were ruddy, was ill with anaemia.

The spring is deep, and the water, pure. Unfortunately, the spiritual springs were successfully meliorated by large-scale measures of a facade culture. A person came to be ashamed to speak sincerely and freely. On the stage we would make fun of Zhemayte and Aukshtayte slang, mock the student singing in dialect a tune heard from his mother and remain gloomily silent when at the podium milkers "practiced machine milking" and our industrious plowmen did not sow rye but "conducted a struggle" for the cereals harvest.

Our land become economic areas, the grain growers, the "human factor" or an "agronomist". More and more often house management committees and stores, hospital registries and the railroad information desk, first aid and others began to answer on the telephone: "Speak normally.....," that is, not in Lithuanian.

Gradually and imperceptibly the right to speak Lithuanian came by force of inertia to be called by some people nationalist sentiments. Theoreticians appeared who artificially imposed the assimilation of other languages from the cradle virtually.

The official status of Lithuanian is obligatory! Native speech is the voice of the heart, the character of the nation and the memory of culture.

The alphabet of the language is the alphabet of our statehood. It is good that we begin precisely with this, from the first word **Mother** through the most sacred **homeland**.

The act of affirmation of the language is not only an emotion, it is our new view, our new intention expressing the priority of humanitarian culture.

Yes! We should bow our heads before the language and, without embarrassment, ask its forgiveness for the fact that we have as yet done little, truly little, for the good of culture, that it has been and in many instances remains a step-daughter, that books are still kept in disorderly libraries and that to culture we have politely replied: "Wait a while, be a little more patient, it is not yet time."

The proposed constitutional amendment primarily in respect of the language is a behest for work for the good of the Lithuanian language and culture and for the formulation for ourselves and for all a program of future work. The year of 1997 is not that far off. How will we greet it, in what letters will we record the date which is dear to us—"450th anniversary of the first Lithuanian book—the Mazvydas Catechism"?

Having had our say, let us not forget others. Lithuanian does not belong only to us. Baltic studies is an international science cultivated in many countries and in practically all scientific centers of the world (universities in which comparative linguistics is studied). Besides Vilnius and Riga, in the field of Baltic studies scholars are working in Moscow and Rostov-na-Donu and in other cities of the USSR. Among the socialist countries mention should be made of Poland (Poznan, Cracow, Warsaw) and Czechoslovakia (Prague, Brno), and there are Baltic scholars in Bulgaria, Romania and Yugoslavia. Among the capitalist countries Baltic studies are most extensively developed in the FRG (Goettingen, Muenster, Munich) and the United States (Chicago, Pennsylvania). There are many Baltic scholars in Sweden, France, Italy, Switzerland, Japan, Australia.... Hundreds of universities are collaborating permanently with the World Baltic Studies Center in Vilnius. This undoubtedly confirms that the proposal which we are discussing does not amount to provincial pretensions but a logical conclusion.

Vilnius is preparing to receive in 1990 participants in the second international Baltic studies conference. This forum is a matter not only for the university's Baltic Philology Department. I propose that it be supported in every possible way thanks to the elaboration of a comprehensive plan of activities at the republic level. We need right now to cardinaly tackle the question of the status of the publication BALTISTIKA, make it a subscription journal, invigorate the activity of the LiSSR Academy of Sciences Language Commission, accelerate the editing and publication of a dictionary of the modern Lithuanian language, provide Baltic scholars and publishers with modern equipment and expand the activity of Baltic scholars and their international relations.

An opportune word is more precious than gold. Good words engender friends, bad ones, enemies.... Lithuanian folk sayings are suffused with profound sense. They remind us also of the situation concerning other languages in the republic. What is it like?

In areas where there is a need, newspapers are published in Russian or Polish. Certain plant newspapers are copied, and also the journal TARIBINE MOTERIS in Polish, the newspaper KOMYAUNIMO TIYESA, in Russian, and others are published. There are republic papers which are published in Russian and Polish. Nor has book publishing been forgotten. The series "Lithuanian Prose, Poetry and Current Affairs Writing,"

literature for children and scientific works are published in Russian. Many books obtained from central publishing houses are on sale.

Despite the high loss rate (over R200,000), all primers for the Polish high schools are published annually in our republic alone, and the republic's bookstores obtain from Poland and sell R400,000 worth of books a year. Cultural exchange with Poland not only is not narrowing but it has recently been time for it to be expanding on a parity basis.

It is annoying that owing to inhibition, perhaps, if not sluggishness, we have as yet done next to nothing to ensure a better supply of primers, books, newspapers and journals to the Lithuanian colonies in Poland, Belorussia, Kaliningrad Oblast and elsewhere. Our neighbors themselves have not, unfortunately, displayed any concern about this and have sometimes even, having politely apologized, prevented it. I would hereby like to recall that the world's Lithuanian national minorities—in Europe and across the ocean—publish in Lithuanian over 100 newspapers and journals and maintain approximately 10 or more publishing houses.

And we not only will not reduce the publication of books in Russian and Polish but will expand the publication of bilingual dictionaries, textbooks and other teaching literature. It is important to note that the Lithuanian language primer published in August in an edition of 50,000 copies has already sold out. We will shortly reprint it. An extensive program of the publication of linguistic literature is being drawn up.

The official status of Lithuanian will force all of us to adopt an attitude of even greater responsibility toward requests in the cultural sphere of representatives of other peoples. Thus at the present time we are working on restoration of a large collection, which was preserved in the war years, of unique Jewish publications running to 200,000 volumes.

It is said that all's well that ends well. But sometimes a good beginning has a bad end. I have been thinking that if we vote for an official Lithuanian language, and it becomes isolated and embellished with peacock feathers, no good will come of it. Language is enriched and developed only in interaction with other languages. For this reason we must all take pains to ensure that as many masterpieces of world literature as possible continue to be translated into Lithuanian and that the training of translators and the study of languages become our common concern and requirement.

Knowledge of languages is a condition of cultural sovereignty. Knowing many languages has not hitherto, seemingly, been required. On trips abroad it was sufficient to mutter "Guten Tag" and "how do you do". But now? The expanding economic, trade and cultural contacts require more. And a translator cannot be provided for every executive or specialist, nor would it be economical.

At festivities devoted to the language and in the streets and at meetings also there are, as I have noticed, very many participants. Only will there be as many hands? The critical state of Lithuanian is causing concern—it is becoming slang. It is necessary to adopt urgent measures to halt this process. Only we will hardly be helped by language festivities involving processions and flags. A course in the culture of Lithuanian for all special disciplines of the republic's VUZes would be an effective resource. Nor would it do any harm for officials of ministries, establishments, societies and other organizations to display concern for the purity of the language. The language is particularly impoverished in clerical work, record-keeping and decrees, and book publishing and the press still have many sins to account for. Demonstrations are no help here.

We are today touching on sacred things, spirituality, essentially. The language, the flag, the anthem! It is not at every session that we sense the breath of history.

So let us try to ensure that the Lithuanian word and the sacred symbols do not lose their humanitarian resonance.

We are all becoming politicians and tribunes today. The word should serve the noble struggle of opinions, and not tired verbiage. Democracy and high standards of political speech are inalienable.

The apotheosis of pluralism must not become market politics.

So, if you have the right words, you'll get there!

The commission, in which well-known specialists in the field of Lithuanian language worked, has prepared a draft edict of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The work was performed collegially and democratically and with an active exchange of opinions. I would like on behalf of the commission to insert certain amendments.

In our view, "in accordance with the procedure determined by the LiSSR Council of Ministers" needs to be inserted in clause 2 after the word "gradually".

In the commission's opinion, the first paragraph of clause 9 should end without the final sentence inasmuch as it constitutes petty regulation of the status of the VUZ's.

The final paragraph should not contain the words "in units of the USSR Armed Forces" since this is outside of the republic's jurisdiction.

I propose that the amendment to the constitution proclaiming Lithuanian the official language be confirmed and that the draft edict, following the corresponding editing, be submitted for discussion in the republic's press.

I approve of the national song becoming the national anthem, and the national flag, the state flag, and propose

that the Vitis emblem be confirmed not as the national emblem but as the national symbol.

Speech of M. Adamavichyus

Delegates to the 22d rayon party conference instructed me to present the following appeal at the republic Supreme Soviet session addressed to the Lithuanian CP Central Committee and the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The processes of democratization and glasnost occurring in the country have altered the customary progress of life in the republic and our rayon. The public assertiveness and national self-awareness of the citizens are growing sharply. Following the adoption on 6 October 1988 of the Supreme Soviet Presidium decree "The Status of Lithuanian" village meetings were held in the majority of the rayon's outfits, in which a Polish- and Russian-speaking population is preponderant, to discuss this edict. All inhabitants of the rayon, including the communists, treat with understanding and respect the proposal concerning recognition of Lithuanian as the official language and support it. The language is undoubtedly a most striking distinguishing characteristic of a nation and a spiritual value thereof.

But all national problems require a balanced, comprehensive approach based on an in-depth analysis and objective evaluations of each specific situation. They should be tackled calmly and extremely responsibly and within the framework of the socialist democracy and legality befitting a state with the rule of law, primarily by way of reciprocal steps and without detriment to the international cohesion of our peoples. The proposed wording of the law in respect of the functioning of other languages is unduly simplified.

The question of language today is a question of international relations, a question of policy. The history of our country and the republic confirms in numerous examples to what neglect in inter-nation relations leads. It is essential to buttress the development of the standards of inter-nation dealings in all social and political life by a law, and not one-sided but comprehensive, what is more.

In the opinion of the inhabitants of our rayon, the draft law on the official language does not constitutionally guarantee the equal functioning of Polish on the territory of areas of the Vilnius zone, where the indigenous inhabitants are mainly Poles, constituting approximately 70 percent. In turn, the LiSSR Constitution should also guarantee Russian, as the language of inter-nation communication of the peoples of our country, equality.

At the behest of the 22d Vilnyuskiy Rayon Party Conference I submit the following proposals:

1. On the territory of areas of the Vilnius region, where Poles constitute the majority of the indigenous population, to accord Polish and Russian official language status.

2. Upon adoption of the article of the constitution concerning citizenship of the LiSSR to proceed from the proposition concerning the equality of all USSR citizens resident on the territory of the Soviet Union.

The question of migration of the population of the country and the republic not to be decided by administrative-command methods.

3. The LiSSR Constitution to guarantee the equality of the peoples of all nationalities resident on the territory of the republic in questions of work, culture and education (higher, secondary, vocational) without any discrimination and also at the time of promotion to executive office.

4. To form under the auspices of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet a council of nationalities.

We believe that yesterday's complaint by Comrade Klimas in respect of the republic Supreme Soviet session does not correspond to reality. Of the 358 conference delegates, 68 voted against, one abstained and all the rest voted in favor. Special tellers were appointed at the time of vote.

Speech of Deputy Y. Lukauskas

Dear Deputies and Guests,

The present session is truly exceptional. It is a historic day for, after all, we are discussing questions of spirituality which are of such importance to our people. Therefore today, fulfilling the instructions of my electorate and also expressing my own profound conviction, I wish to propose the adoption of the decree on Lithuanian becoming the official language and our national yellow-green-red flag becoming the state flag, and the "National Song" of V. Kudirka, the national anthem. This will symbolize also our behests to future generations.

Dear comrades,

A question was put from the floor concerning the emblem. The emblems of our fraternal republics have been baked, as it were, in the same mold. Necessarily with a hammer and sickle and so forth. But I very much like the Vitis, the White Vitis on a dark-claret background. I would not say that I, like many others also, do not like the Gediminas pillars, which are the emblem of "Sayudis," which has so caught the fancy of the people. The Gediminas pillars might be more suitable, possibly, than the hammer and sickle. We should therefore give a little more thought to the emblem. We should, perhaps, consult the people and legalize the official emblem together with the new Lithuanian Constitution. And meanwhile adopt the proposal made today by Yu. Nekroshyus: confirm Vitis as the national symbol.

Resolution on Working Group To Draft LiSSR Constitution

*18000325a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
20 Nov 88 pp 1-2*

[Text of Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On the Draft of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution"]

[Text] After hearing information from the leader of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Working Group section on improving the Constitution, Lithuanian SSR minister of justice P. Kuris, the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees as follows:

1. To take into consideration that the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Working Group section on improving the Constitution has completed its work and has submitted a draft Lithuanian SSR Constitution that must be evaluated as the basis for organizing further work to draw up the Fundamental Law of the Lithuanian SSR.

2. In order to further prepare a draft Lithuanian SSR Constitution to form a commission made up of deputies of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, as follows:

—commission chairman: **Brazauskas**, Algirdas Mikolas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee;

commission members:

—**Aleynikovas**, Yonas, tractor driver at the "Skapishkis" kolkhoz in Kupishskiy rayon;

—**Antanaytis**, Yustinas, secretary of the Lithuanian republic Trade Union Council;

—**Astrauskas**, Vitautas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet;

—**Bogdanas**, Konstantinas, sculptor;

—**Berezov**, Vladimir, chief of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Organizational Party Work Department;

—**Bernatavichus**, Yuozas, first deputy chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Lithuanian SSR State Agricultural Committee;

—**Bernotas**, Alfonsas, chairman of Ukmergskiy rayon soviet of people's deputies ispolkom;

—**Budrikis**, Viktoras, secretary of the Lithuanian republic Trade Union Council;

—**Byarukshtis**, Adolfas, chief of the Lithuanian SSR Ministry of Health Fourth Department;

—**Vaytkyavichyus**, Narimantas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Panevezhis Gorkom;

—**Vileykis**, Algirdas Anatoliyus, ispolkom chairman of the Vilnius city soviet of people's deputies;

—**Virshulis**, Antanas, chief editor of the journal KOMMUNIST;

—**Visotskis**, Algimantas, military commissar of the Lithuanian SSR;

—**Gaubene**, Stanislava, chief economist at the "Zhlibinay" kolkhoz in Plungeskiy rayon;

—**Gedraytis**, Stanislovas, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee;

—**Guretskas**, Yonas, secretary of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium;

—**Gushchinas**, Adolfas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Ionishkskiy raykom;

—**Dromantas**, Yonas, rector of the Lithuanian Agricultural Academy;

—**Yemelyanov**, Vasiliy, editor of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA LITVA;

—**Zhalis**, Alfonsas, ispolkom chairman of the Klaypeda city soviet of people's deputies;

—**Zhukauskas**, Algirdas, vice president of the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences;

—**Zaykauskas**, Bronislovas, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Gosplan;

—**Zaletskas**, Kestutis, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Vilnius Gorkom;

—**Ignotas**, Pyatras, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers;

—**Karbauskis**, Cheslovas Vitautas, chairman of the "Didisis Spalis" kolkhoz in Shyaylyayskiy rayon;

—**Klikunene**, Vanda, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium;

—**Kubilyus**, Valeriyonas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Kretingskiy raykom;

—**Kuris**, Pranas, Lithuanian SSR minister of justice;

—**Laurushas**, Vitautas, board chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Union of Composers;

- Lisauskas**, Stasis, Lithuanian SSR minister of internal affairs;
 - Lukauskas**, Yonas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR People's Control Committee;
 - Maksimovas**, Lenginas, chairman of the Lithuanian republic trade union council;
 - Marazas**, Vintsas Pyatras, chairman of the "Zhelsvyale" kolkhoz in Kapsukskiy rayon;
 - Martsinkyavichyus**, Yustinas, people's poet of the Lithuanian SSR;
 - Masyan**, Danuta, farm manager at the "Za mir" kolkhoz in Shalchininksiy rayon;
 - Matsaytis**, Alfonsas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Komsomol Central Committee;
 - Mezhelaytis**, Eduardas, deputy chairman of Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, people's poet of the Lithuanian SSR;
 - Misyunas**, Yonas Algirdas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Court;
 - Morkunas**, Vatslovas, Lithuanian SSR minister for labor and social security;
 - Morkunas**, Povilas, gorispolkom chairman of the Shyaylyay city soviet of people's deputies;
 - Murashko**, Mikhail, fitter-assembler at the Vilnius "Zhalgiris" Machine Tool Plant;
 - Novikov**, Arseniy, personal pensioner;
 - Pozhela**, Yuras, president of the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences;
 - Rimaytis**, Romualdas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Kaunas Gorkom;
 - Sabutis**, Lyudvikas, Lithuanian SSR procurator;
 - Sakalauskas**, Vitautas, chairman of Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers;
 - Sikorskis**, Yuožas Antanas, brigade leader at the Kaunas Production Machine Tool Association imeni F. Dzerzhinskiy;
 - Sikorskis**, Romualdas, Lithuanian SSR minister of finance;
 - Sinkevich**, Zigmont, fitter at the Vilnius Auto Repair Plant;
 - Stadulene**, Veronika, director of the Alitus "Daynava" Sewn Goods Factory;
 - Statulyavichyus**, Vitautas, director of the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Mathematics and Cybernetics;
 - Chuplinskis**, Algis, general director of Lithuanian "Sigma" Production Association;
 - Shepetis**, Lenginas, Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee secretary;
 - Sheris**, Yuožas, first deputy chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers;
 - Shileykis**, Pyatras, brigade leader in the Vilnyusstroy Construction-and-Assembly Trust;
 - Shlevinskene**, Brone, teacher at the Lyankima secondary school in Skuodasskiy rayon;
 - Eysmuntas**, Eduardas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Committee for State Security;
 - Yuozenas-Baltushis**, Albertas Yuožas, people's writer of the Lithuanian SSR.
3. When it has completed final work on preparing a draft of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution the commission shall submit it to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium so that in January/February 1989 it can be presented for public debate.
- [signed] V. Astrauskas, Chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.
- Y. Guretskas, Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Secretary.
- Vilnius, 18 November 1988.
- LiSSR Minister of Justice on Constitution Working Group Progress**
18000325b Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 21 Nov 88 p 2
- [Unattributed report: "The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet 10th Session 11th Convocation: On the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR. Information from the Lithuanian SSR Minister of Justice, Deputy P. Kuris, on the Work Done by the Section on Improving the Constitution in the Working Group Set up under the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]
- [Text] Esteemed deputies and guests of the session. The perestroika initiated by the party, whose policy was set forth in the decrees of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th All-Union Party Conference, has now been under way for 4 years in the country and is gradually becoming a practical affair for millions of people. And the population

of our republic, having a sense of responsibility for the present and the future of their homeland, have rid themselves of apathy and indifference and are assuming firm civic stances. Democratization and glasnost have liberated a mighty flow of thoughts, emotions and initiatives and are gradually cleansing the atmosphere of public life and encouraging vigorous creative activity. A revolutionary process of renewal has started, that must affect the legal foundations of the life of the state and society and, of course, the Constitution as the Fundamental Law of the state. Under the conditions of the new political and legal thinking and the creation of a socialist legal state, the gap between the officially declared Constitution and the actual situation is becoming increasingly obvious. This misalignment can be seen on the scale of the entire country but it is seen even more clearly in the union republics.

The second Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR now in force (as is known, the first was adopted in 1940) was drawn up and adopted by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet in 1978, during the period of stagnation and general indifference, and it does not fulfill the role of regulator and stimulator for social processes and does not correspond to the social reality. It has been partly transformed into a special kind of brake on perestroika and renewal. Reform of the political system in accordance with the laws of logic must be initiated with improvements to the Constitution since the most significant changes must inevitably be reflected in the Constitution.

Today we all are witnesses to and participants in the accelerating process of politicization of the masses. The history of Lithuania truly has seen no such active expression of the political will of the republic's inhabitants in the demand for a new version of the Constitution. The idea of a new Constitution is a logical response to the economic diktat of the central departments, the practice of extreme centralization in recent years, and the neglect of the state, national and cultural sovereignty of the republic, which is gradually transforming a federative state into a unitary state. The idea of constitutional reform is logical and it embodies the aspiration to restore the Leninist understanding of Soviet federation as a voluntary union of sovereign republics and sovereign states.

Great influence has been exerted on this process by the awakened national self-awareness of the Lithuanian people and the revived historical memory and strengthened hopes that under the new conditions of democracy and a socialist legal state many of the attributes of sovereignty lost during the course of history will be restored. You will agree, esteemed deputies, that this is most valuable and important for a people who created their own statehood early in the 13th century, a people who possess one of the most perfect legal systems in Europe and in the world (I refer to the Lithuanian Statute), a people who have preserved their own language, writing and culture.

Of course, the USSR Constitution and the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR now in force proclaim that the union republic is a sovereign Soviet socialist state.

Unfortunately, articles 73, 74, 75 and others of the USSR Constitution severely limit this sovereignty of the republic. The public in the republic has been and is active in proposing changes and improvements to existing legislation, in particular to the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR, and it is making demands for the adoption of new laws. The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium alone has received more than a thousand such proposals, and today even more have been additionally circulated among deputies attending the session. The new ideas in political and legal thinking, expressing the aspirations and will of the republic's population, are a very valuable stimulus for legislation.

In order to generalize and work on specific solutions regarding the proposals from the labor collective, public organizations, and figures in science, culture and the arts, and also other citizens of the republic, aimed at improving the constitutional legislation and enhancing the role of the soviets of people's deputies, the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium resolution of 22 June 1988 created under the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium a working group to deal with improvements in constitutional legislation and enhancing the role of the soviets of people's deputies. I have been leading one of the sections in this working group, namely the section on improving the Constitution. In addition to the professional jurists—Academician Yu. Bulavas, Professor S. Vansyavichyus, Doctor of Legal Sciences Ya. Galinaytite, docents K. Lapinskas, Z. Namavichyus and S. Stachekas, lawyer K. Lipeyki, and jurists V. Gerzhonas and Yu. Zhilis—the section also includes well-known figures from the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroika, including the philosopher A. Yuzaytis, professors Yu. Yuzelyunas and V. Landsbergis, the poet Yu. Martsinkyavichyus, the journalist V. Tomkus, the movie director A. Zhebryunas and the writer M. Slutskis.

It was the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences that sponsored the initiative to work on a draft for a new Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR. After it had been prepared by the Academy of Sciences, on 22 September the draft was submitted to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Accordingly, when working on the draft of the Fundamental Law of the republic, the section proceeded in its work from the draft prepared by the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences, analyzed the existing republic Constitution, and studied the constitutions of other federative states.

Many proposals from members of the Semy Council of the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroika were included in the draft Constitution.

The draft Constitution that has been drawn up is a draft for the Fundamental Law of an independent state maintaining vitally important links with the USSR. The leitmotif of the entire document is the idea of the sovereignty of the republic, sealed in all its aspects—political, ideological, economic, social and cultural.

On 11 November the draft Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR was submitted for consideration by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The question logically arises: what more needs to be done with this draft? The matter seems a simple one only at first glance: many people are even proposing that on the basis of articles 77, 97 and 172 of the existing Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR, the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet can already adopt the new Constitution.

But many deputies are well aware that the third paragraph of article 76 of the USSR Constitution establishes that "a union republic shall have its own constitution conforming to the Constitution of the USSR and taking into account the specific features of the republic." To the point, this provision also predetermined the content of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution now in force, and, incidentally, of the other union republics, since it follows almost word for word the text of the USSR Constitution. The new text distributed to the deputies shows that the draft of the new edition of the Constitution departs from the letter and content of the USSR Constitution and consequently acts in direct conflict with article 76 of the USSR Constitution. Since the esteemed deputies have read this text they have obviously noticed the provisions contained in article 6 and chapter 2, where giving due consideration to the concept of economic independence for the republic a provision has been formulated on republic property. The provisions in chapters 5 and 6 on citizenship of the Lithuanian SSR and the rights, freedoms and obligations of citizens are formulated differently than in the USSR Constitution. Article 68 states that the Lithuanian SSR is a sovereign state basing its relations with the USSR and the other sovereign republics on a treaty basis. And finally, I would like to draw attention to article 70, which states that "the laws of the USSR operate on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR only if they are not at variance with the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR." A quite contrary principle has been asserted in the USSR Constitution now in force: article 74 states that "in the event of discrepancy between a union republic law and an all-union law, the law of the USSR shall prevail." A legally complex situation has taken shape since while the present USSR Constitution is in force, because it makes no provision for legal procedure to resolve conflict. As yesterday's reaction by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to the amendment to the republic constitution adopted on 16 November at a session of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet regarding the priority of a republic law over a all-union law shows, an amendment to a republic constitution will in all probability be declared illegal and invalid, based on article 74.

Thus, adoption of the articles of a Lithuanian SSR Constitution that are at variance with or not in accordance with the USSR Constitution may lead to certain confrontation with all-union appellant levels and then the conflict

will move from the legal sphere into the political sphere. You, esteemed deputies, must decide how to proceed, proceeding from your own political wisdom, conscience and farsightedness, with a proper sense of responsibility for the consequences of your own decisions.

In my opinion it is also impossible to ignore the democratic nature of a procedure that will inevitably be violated in an over hasty vote on the draft constitution. The public in the republic and you, esteemed deputies, have had no opportunity to familiarize yourselves with the draft (some of the deputies who spoke mentioned this) since the section from the working group was not empowered to announce it officially. Moreover, the draft still needs to be edited and corrected; its provisions have not been worked with sufficient exactness. This must be recognized. And although we all want a new constitution, nevertheless, as the ancients said, Plato is a friend but truth is dearer. I have no reason to doubt the authority of the Sejm of the Lithuanian Movement on the issue of the right to produce a draft constitution. As is known, the Sejm has approved the draft and has called on the deputies of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet to vote on it at this session. But today I was handed an additional protocol from the Sejm session, signed by Avridas Yuozaytis, in which proposals and comments are set forth on a new edition for the Lithuanian SSR Constitution. The protocol consists of 11 pages. And how in this case can such a particularly important law be adopted at the session if there are so many corrections! I should also say that even in the section of the working group there was much polemic regarding particular provisions of the constitution, and opposing opinions were expressed and compromise decisions reached.

To the point, even this present session has shown that we have almost no practical experience of parliamentarianism, particularly if differing opinions are expressed, and we are incapable even of voting correctly immediately; we have become too accustomed to expressing a single opinion. Because of a few amendments the voting procedure has become very complicated. And what if we had to vote on all 178 articles of the Constitution?

Taking the above into account, I propose to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet at today's session, taking into consideration the present draft Constitution, that it set up a commission of deputies or a commission of the council to prepare a new edition of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution (or a new Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR). The commission chairman should be one of the most authoritative leaders in Lithuania, perhaps the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary Algirdas Brazauskas. After discussion of the present draft and its amendments and corrections the Presidium parliamentary commission would be able to submit it for national debate. Only after the most democratic procedure could the Constitution be discussed and adopted by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Supsov Deputies Discuss LiSSR Draft Constitution

18000325c Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
27 Nov 88 pp 2-3

[Unattributed report: "Tenth Session of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet 11th Convocation. The Discussions on the Question of the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR"]

[Text]

The Speech of Deputy Ch. Karbauskis.

We all dream of, demand and crave democracy. Today's morning session showed how necessary it is. If at a general meeting of kolkhoz farmers I presented to the kolkhoz board resolutions in the kind of form as the resolution of the Presidium was presented for consideration by the session, by the deputies, I would not long remain chairman of that kolkhoz. And I have been such a chairman for 20 years.

Hence a second conclusion: kolkhoz democracy is at the highest level of democracy here in Lithuania. For it is only in the kolkhozes, as comrade Yu. Yarashunas has noted, that "Sajudis" has remained banded together. Evidently people have enough democracy, there are no movements for democracy in the countryside, and people work (and in the present conditions of democracy in the collectives it is possible to work normally), and things have been well organized. Therefore, a decision on the question of a constitution for Lithuania brooks no delay but is raised with all acuteness.

Democratic centralism and democratic control must nevertheless be changed. For as you see, the present situation had been dictated precisely by centralism. This kind of attitude has been demonstrated to the deputies before the eyes of all Lithuania and all inhabitants of the republic. And this has greatly affected the deputies. Specifically, yesterday I took part in the television program "Vyaydrodis." There were many telephone calls, written proposals and personal appeals. The people of Shyaylay in particular were phoning in. They were asking that everything possible be done to adopt the constitution tomorrow, no matter how late. In my opinion we cannot adopt a constitution today. If we talk about democracy we must not act undemocratically. The proposals from the "Sajudis" representatives, who are great democrats, are today really unsound. We cannot adopt a constitution today. First because adequate work has not been done on it and there are many contradictions in some articles.

I propose that a parliamentary commission be set up in order to complete the draft that has been submitted, then present it for national debate, and only then confirm the Constitution at a session of the Supreme Soviet, possibly an extraordinary session.

Speech of Session Guest Professor V. Landsbergis.

Esteemed deputies and guests. Discussion of the additions to the USSR Constitution and discussion of a new version of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution is an important, if not decisive historical moment on the road toward the kind of Soviet Union that we want and the kind of place that we want Soviet Lithuania to occupy in it. By we I mean not those who have gathered here, not some particular organization, movement or group. By we I mean the Republic and its people, whom you, esteemed deputies, may represent and may hear the approval of the people if you sense the basic aspirations of the people.

Today these aspirations are historical and social justice expressed by the concepts of independence for the republic and its sovereignty. This concept is inscribed and proclaimed in the existing fundamental laws, but the reality inherited from the era of Stalin's reign and the period of stagnation is more a mockery of the republic's independence and sovereignty. It is no longer possible to be reconciled to that reality. And indeed, the new era of perestroika associated with the name of Gorbachev makes sense only when words that have previously been slandered acquire true meaning.

Thus, Lenin's concept of the Soviet Union should acquire its true meaning. Union is not annexation and not attachment but precisely union. An agreement between equal members for a common goal, which in this case is the building of socialism. For there are countries—countries of popular democracy—that are also building socialism, and the first builder does not regard them as political or ideological criminals. If we choose union it should be just that—chosen, and acceptable and useful for everyone and in all relations. Imposed union is not union but something quite different.

This is why our desire to have a better, more just Soviet Union is not only protecting the interests of the republic but also making a contribution to real perestroika in the country, to the advantage and on behalf of the prestige of the Soviet Union, a contribution to greater international trust and peace throughout the world.

On the other hand, the primary duty of this Supreme Soviet is to express the interests of its own electors, the interests of the people of the republic.

We should not have to beg for what belongs to us. Favors generate the false impression that someone beyond the borders of Lithuania is permitting it or not permitting it to do something on a legal basis. It must be recognized that in the highest moral and legal sense things are quite different and should be quite different.

We have the right on this land to use it as we will, to build enterprises or not to build them, and to produce on it what we ourselves decide will be produced. This right should not be humbly petitioned nor necessarily and

ceremonially proclaimed; what is needed is to talk about it calmly and seriously and with dignity at this session.

It must be formulated in precise, forward-looking provisions as in article 70 of the new version of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution, to which I draw your attention: USSR laws operate on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR only if they are not at variance with the Lithuanian SSR Constitution.

The "Sajudis" Sejm has proposed to the Supreme Soviet that it discuss and adopt in its entirety the draft Lithuanian SSR Constitution approved by the Sejm. Both this and the earlier version have been published in ATGIMI-MASE and have evoked numerous responses and proposals. This would be a decisive step, a rejection of our typical half-way policy and our glancing about to see which way the wind is blowing. To this end it would also be possible to continue the session so that a Constitution can be adopted before 29 November. It is possible to adopt several of the most important articles while the Constitution is put into the machine of parliamentary procedure, hoping with goodwill to adopt the Constitution at an extraordinary session in December or sometime later, but in this case it is vitally necessary to adopt already now at least the important article 70. It is not so terrible that on Monday it may be announced somewhere that it is invalid. What is important is to express the will of the republic unencumbered by outdated Brezhnevian documents. It should not be forgotten that with their signatures against diktat and centralization 1.7 million of Lithuania's inhabitants have already expressed themselves in favor of independence for the republic.

This is also an historic opportunity, an historic event which after 29 November, if a conservative, revisionist trend prevails at the top and hands are wrung and the machinery of a formal vote is brought into play, may be an opportunity no longer available. The Estonians have used this opportunity and have adopted similar article in their Constitution according to which their republic has the final word with regard to any all-union law or Estonian SSR enforceable enactment. The next day there was a holiday in Estonia and general rejoicing, rallying our Baltic brothers for further peaceful political struggle. And there could also be a holiday in Lithuania tomorrow, to the accompaniment of joyous Sunday bells, even though we know we face a difficult path to the truth, self-respect and prosperity. The gates of this path are still closed but you already hold the key in your hand.

These are the main issues that I wanted to talk about in my appeal to the civic awareness of the deputies. And people in the city, aware of events in other places, are already gathering signatures for a new appeal that they have written: "If the session of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet is legally unable to adopt the new Constitution we propose that an amendment be made as has been done in the example of the Estonians."

For myself, I would like to add that to leave the Estonians all alone would be a very doubtful position. I shall convey the lists from the petition to the Presidium.

And finally, a personal word. I would like the highly esteemed and much-loved Algirdas Brazauskas to stand firm as a rock in this stormy sea. I hope that all communists, who desire the good of Lithuania, the working class, the peasantry, "Sajudis," the trade unions, the Academy of Sciences and other organizations will rally around him and that this unity of will cannot be overcome.

Speech of Deputy S. Gedraytis.

We see clearly that there is no one in this hall who is not concerned for the future of Soviet Lithuania and its sovereignty, and questions of further strengthening its statehood.

The entire Lithuanian people lives in enormous hope and faith in this, particularly its younger generation, which the older generation perceives with great alarm and concern. We should not forget that the foundation of the renewal of society and its self-awareness was laid by the perestroika initiated by the party and by the policy of democratization and glasnost pursued by CPSU Central Committee first secretary M.S. Gorbachev. Our future and the future of other Soviet peoples and of the entire country are linked with this man and with perestroika in general. As we move along this path we must act reasonably and in a well-considered manner, and at the same time with adequate decisiveness, as revolutionary perestroika demands.

We have been waiting for a long time for this historic session and the moment when the Lithuanian language and national flag become the official language and flag, and V. Kudirki's "National Anthem" becomes the official anthem. This comes from all of us under the active effect of "Sajudis" and the confident and sensible leadership of the older generation. The foundations of the national and cultural revival were laid by all the generations and all the people. This must be valued, and conclusions must be drawn. Today a parliamentary commission will be set up to make the final preparations on the draft of the new republic Constitution, which will then be presented for national debate. We appraise highly the draft prepared by the "Sajudis" Sejm and we believe that it must be discussed by all the people. Only after we have taken counsel with the people, with the entire nation, must we make a final decision. With regard to the proposals and additions to the Lithuanian SSR Constitution offered by "Sajudis," some must be incorporated into the new Constitution since those proposals are important. Laws passed by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet must operate in Lithuania. The all-union laws should strengthen the union of our republics and safeguard the interests of the republics. Improvements to the new draft USSR Constitution and the active participation of the masses in its final preparation are therefore essential. I was in the region of Orel, where

General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev talked about further urgent factors in the important national issues and problems of independence for the republics. He emphasized that these issues will be resolved and that for this, what is required is cohesive, well-considered work. And I believe that if we work actively we shall achieve this.

We all carry responsibility for the future of our republic and we must act in a well-considered and correct manner. There should be no haste. I support the opinion of farm leader comrade Karbauskas in this matter. We must strive for two equally important goals: democratic changes to the USSR Constitution and the adoption of a new Constitution for our republic, as a single whole. Together with the new constitutions of the other union republics it will serve as a basis for shaping a qualitatively new sovereignty for the republic and also as a prerequisite for the creation of a new democratic legislative system. The final decision must be made after a referendum has been held and after taking counsel with the people.

Speech of Deputy A. Chuplinskas.

The issue being considered is extraordinarily complex. In my opinion, much work has been done to prepare the draft Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR. It will please many of those who have already had the opportunity to familiarize themselves with it. But it does contain many questions that should be based on the documents that we learned about from the main report. Many articles on the economic sovereignty of our republic have been inadequately prepared. The Constitution is a law of extraordinary importance and it must be studied in depth and then be observed by every citizen. We need aware citizens who understand in depth the essential nature and meaning of the Constitution. Accordingly, we must not bypass broad public debate here. We must be logical and consistent in our principles. This broad debate without haste will enable each citizen to familiarize himself with it, study it, and express his opinion on all points of interest in the new Constitution. The very process of debate will be very useful in the matter of further strengthening democracy. People will feel a sense of responsibility as they participate actively in the adoption of this important document. Therefore the draft new version of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution that has been prepared must be worked on more quickly in the commission and submitted for national debate. Then there will be no need to make changes and additions to the existing Constitution. For it seems to me to be lacking in seriousness to change the USSR Constitution in parts and over very long periods, while, in my opinion, the draft resolution prolongs this procedure excessively. The modern mass media make it possible to discuss the draft Constitution in a short period, the more so since the public has been showing great interest in it for a long time. The work will undoubtedly move quickly. Accepting in principle what has been presented in the draft and considerably reducing the preparation and adoption procedure itself, I therefore propose that

the draft of the new Constitution be presented in mid-February. I think that it will be possible to do this. In my opinion, it is now necessary to do what we can. First and foremost enable the people to familiarize themselves broadly with it and obtain their approval, and during that time, it seems to me, everything will be done and comrade A. Brazauskas will stand firm as rock so that the republic wins the right to adopt a new Constitution.

Speech of Deputy Z. Kazykonene.

Esteemed deputies, I do not intend to command your attention for long since I do not like to speak at length. And even without me those speaking here have expressed many fine thoughts. I would like merely to say a few words. The voters brought me here to the session so that I might justify their aspirations and hopes. I agree with the sensible changes in the draft Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR. Only, perhaps we cannot adopt it without national debate. I propose that these questions be considered soon in the parliamentary commission that will be set up, and only adopted after that.

Speech of Deputy Yu. Kuplyauskene.

I shall not talk about the importance of the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR or the need for its quick confirmation by the Supreme Soviet. I think that today it has become clear from many of the statements that the question of whether or not we shall discuss the Lithuanian SSR Fundamental Law—the Constitution—today will not be raised and will not be considered. I therefore would like to ask all deputies that this draft we published in the press so that all the inhabitants of the republic are able to familiarize themselves with it. This will enable the commission of deputies to discuss it more seriously and, I think, the opinion of the people will be expressed more quickly. The draft Constitution will be approved more quickly by the machinery of the deputies. In my opinion, this procedure should be concluded sometime before the new year.

I would like to draw the attention of all deputies to the subject of discussion of another matter that has been little touched upon. For we have all met voters and many of you have been given instructions to confirm the Constitution. In my opinion, however, today it is necessary to turn our attention to those amendments to the existing Constitution that will guarantee the independence of our republic in both the economic and the political sense, without waiting for further work on the new version of our Constitution. For today it is still not known how the question of the agenda for the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will be decided, or whether our resolutions will be considered. I ask all deputies to turn their attention today to all these proposals and to article 70 of the new Constitution, and I propose that all deputies today support, possibly even by a vote, the inclusion of these amendments in the existing Constitution. I approve the opinion of those speaking earlier and

I would like propose to deputies that they adopt a declaration of the following kind:

Declaration of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet on the Sovereignty of the Lithuanian SSR, and an Appeal to All the Lithuanian People, the Peoples of the USSR, and the Community of the Peoples of the World.

(I draw your attention to the fact that those speaking before me reminded us that the Estonians have already adopted a similar document. And what we have here is merely a declaration of the Supreme Soviet. I call upon everyone to support our neighbors and brothers-in-arms. Four republics were granted permission to conduct an experiment in economic independence and introduce regional cost accounting. The Estonians were the first to start this. Their session ended and the resolutions were adopted. I think that it is our duty as deputies to support them and adopt a similar declaration).

The Lithuanian people have lived since ancient times on the lands around the Baltic Sea. During the 13th century they established their own state, and for centuries defended their freedom and independence. They preserved their language, writing and culture. In 1918 they restored their own statehood. But in 1940 the sovereign Lithuanian state was included as part of the Soviet Union with constitutional guarantees for the sovereignty of Lithuania and the burgeoning of the people. However, during the time of the reign of Stalin and the period of stagnation, domestic policies ignored these provisions and principles of the USSR Constitution and the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR. With the republic's loss of its independence and the increasing diktat of all-union departments, the economy was destabilized, the ecological situation deteriorated steadily, infant mortality rose and life expectancy declined. A threat arose against the gene pool of the Lithuanian people. With the accelerating social injustice, morality declined catastrophically.

The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet sees only one solution to this crisis situation. Further development of Lithuania is possible only under conditions of economic, political and cultural sovereignty. One indispensable condition of that sovereignty is a basis for relations between Lithuania and the USSR by a union treaty. The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet therefore protests against the amendments to the USSR Constitution proposed by the USSR Supreme Soviet that refute the constitutional right of self-determination for all the union republics. The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet declares that until the conclusion of a treaty between the USSR and the Lithuanian SSR, all USSR laws are valid on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR only after ratification at a session of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet. Changes and additions to the USSR Constitution, and also to other enforceable enactments, are valid only after confirmation by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet and corresponding changes and additions to the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR and the republic's legislation. The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet calls on

all people of good will in the republic to band together on behalf of future socialist democracy.

I would thus like to read out and propose the following resolution:

Resolution of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet on a Union Treaty.

The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, guided by the principles of the declaration "On the Sovereignty of the Lithuanian SSR," provides that further relations between the Lithuanian SSR and the USSR will be based on a union treaty concluded on an equal basis. The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet proposes to the USSR Supreme Soviet that a union treaty be concluded and it binds the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to participate in work on the text of this treaty.

Speech of Deputy A. Zhalis.

I fully approve the proposal that the draft of the new republic Constitution be submitted for extensive debate by the public in the republic and the possible holding of a referendum, and that a parliamentary constitutional commission be set up. Obviously we should not prolong the preparatory work and debate, and already by February next year a new Constitution for the republic should be adopted at an extraordinary session of the Supreme Soviet. But it is my deep conviction that there are issues that we also have no right to bypass today. First and foremost we must all adopt an important constitutional amendment proclaiming Lithuanian the official language. Here, we are all well aware that the main and decisive article of the existing republic Constitution is article 68, in which it is stated that the Lithuanian SSR is a sovereign Soviet socialist republic. Lithuania needs this, our people need it. But it is common knowledge that in that same Constitution of ours, just one paragraph later, we have article 70, which states that USSR laws are binding on the territory of Lithuania. This means that whether we like it or not, whether it pleases us or not, in reality this article strikes down article 68.

I think that this should not be, and I propose support for the deputies who think that article 70 should be altered and formulated as in the draft of the new Constitution. I will not read it here. Of course, here the question arises of the hurry, why the rush? I see two reasons for this. The first is that the present article 70 is unconstitutional with respect to our Constitution and with respect to our people, and that therefore it cannot continue any longer. We should have done this earlier since in its present formulation the article itself contains the question of whether or not there should be a sovereign Lithuanian socialist republic. Second, why must we do this today? Because our practice and our life and alas! each day we live shows that many all-union documents prevail over our republic and over our people and ignore their needs and the needs of the republic. This should not be.

Here we adopt the republic plan and the budget for the next year. Once again we are complaining about the neglect of housing construction in the republic, that we are building little. And in fact, this is so and we know the reason for it. Evidently we say too little and for some reason we not finish what we have to say, or take into account how the republic construction program is to be fulfilled. The answer is simple: it is done taking into account the major migration in Lithuania.

We read the statistical reports in which it is stated that during the first 9 months of this year no less than 9,300 arrived in the republic from other republics. After a few years, of course, they will have to be given apartments. You and I recently heard on a television forum that we must provide apartments for several hundred people from Murmansk. A document was adopted on this matter, obliging us to build homes as aid for Murmansk Oblast for people arriving from there in Vilnius, Klaypeda and other cities in the republic. Esteemed comrades, esteemed deputies, can we comply with this instruction? Perhaps we cannot. No matter what, we must talk about this boldly. That is one side of the coin. The other is that we must also boldly say that the powerful, great and native RSFSR should take its own people and build apartments for them, particularly in the non-Chernozem zone where there is a shortage of people, especially in the rural economy where manpower is needed.

Incidentally, there are also other all union decrees that in no way satisfy our people. Not because we are reluctant to understand the essential nature of the matter. This concerns mainly decrees on people from the North and retired officers, for whom, as is known, in compliance with all-union decrees the ispolkoms must provide apartments out of turn. I want to dwell in more detail on this question. In Klaypeda 45 retired officers arrive from other cities, leaving behind good apartments in Volgograd and Smolensk. They came to Klaypeda because they like it there and they went on the lists for apartments. Each year, in accordance with a Council of Ministers resolution we must provide people in these categories with up to 15 apartment buildings per category. What does this mean? For the 8,500 workers in health and education in Klaypeda we were able to allocate only 7 apartment buildings this year. While people from the North were allocated 10 cooperative apartment buildings..

With regard to the people from the North and the retired officers I would like to say unambiguously that without any doubt our republic must provide assistance for the country in opening up the oil and gas deposits and working in the North. And this we do. We work in Tyumen, on the construction of the Baykal-Amur Main Railroad Line. There can be no doubts on this score, no debate. We must also concern ourselves with retired officers who for many years have served the motherland, and the motherland should take care of them. But this is the point: we should be concerned only for those people

who have traveled to work and serve in the army from the republic and have returned to the republic. And let the Latvians, Estonians, Belorussians and citizens of the RSFSR be cared for by their own people. Only in this way is it possible to comply with party and government decrees. Of course, other examples could also be cited testifying to the fact that in many cases all-union documents are not agreed with the republic, or even less give due consideration to the circumstances of which I am speaking. They do not therefore meet the demands of the voters of our republic, or of our population. I call upon you, esteemed deputies, to vote unanimously for changes to article 70 of the republic Constitution and to express your will that our republic should be a sovereign socialist republic.

Speech of Deputy L. Sabutis.

Esteemed deputies and those here present at this solemn forum. It goes without saying that the republic procurator and other procurators would like to exercise the principles of strengthening legality only through legislation approved by the will of the people. Up to now this has not been the case, and we have all condemned this.

The Constitution is the main foundation of legislation and it can be created only by a nation and all the citizens living it, and not by individual groups of people.

As a deputy, a meeting of workers in the procuracy entrusted me to present to the session an appeal from the collective on the subject of the further fate of the two constitutions. Although we have not previously spoken together, our thoughts fully coincide with the thoughts of other jurists expressed here and our appeal will serve as some good office for the deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet who have gone to attend the extraordinary session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

In the situation that has taken shape not through the fault of the republic population, the collective proposes that in the creation of a legal state only one attitude should exist toward the democratic nature of the debate on the adoption both of the USSR Constitution and the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR. We support the proposal to set up a parliamentary commission to work on the republic Constitution and to initiate a national debate without delay. In addition, we must try to achieve a situation in which in accordance with the resolution adopted today at this session, additions to the USSR Constitution are not adopted until equal bases have been establish with regard to a commission made up of representatives of all the union republics to work on a new, precise and complete version of a USSR Constitution agreed with the constitutions of the union republics.

This will enable us to work on the republic Constitution without haste, without pressure and, most important of all, without errors. In the opinion of the collective, the

Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet can now already exercise its sovereign right and the will of the people of the republic as expressed by the signatures of almost two million people.

As republic procurator I would like to report to the deputies that we have repeatedly had the opportunity to be convinced how hastily adopted resolutions may be struck down, and whither lack of objectivity leads. At the same time, delay in consideration of the many issues of importance in particular for us, procuracy workers and other law enforcement bodies, is prolonging adoption of new legislation or fundamental provisions. This situation must be corrected on a countrywide scale. We have submitted a proposal to set up a union of jurists of the republic and would like to receive the approval and support of the government so that the business of working on legal standards shall do well.

While essentially approving the draft Constitution for our republic that has been drawn up, we must remember, esteemed deputies, that we shall not resolve the fate of the procuracy as a centralized department with the articles regulating these provisions in the draft while the all-union law "On the USSR Procuracy" and other all-union enforceable enactments regulating its activity remain in force.

There is also doubt about the provision in the draft Constitution to the effect that procuracy workers and judges may not be elected as deputies by dint of their obligations and the formations in which they are employed. These and other matters need to be discussed.

With respect to the Lithuanian language, we have already passed a law, but procedure for its application is still in the draft stage. The collective at the republic procuracy—420 people—has been established proportional to our corresponding national makeup. For understandable reasons, all official documentation sent to the USSR Procuracy must be prepared only in Russian, but even with this provision we fully approve the law that has been passed and will do everything possible to make the Lithuanian language the full official language in the republic. This is the more essential since the process of legal trial for all criminal, civil, administrative and other cases must take place in the official language.

With respect to the flag and other symbolic matters, we go as far as to say that both state and national should be equally protected by the law, if necessary criminal law.

Speech of Deputy Yu. Pozhela.

It can be seen from the draft Constitution that a whole series of points are at variance with the USSR Constitution. The minister speaking here has set all this forth well and explained it.

Thus, a desperate situation is being created: the republic Constitution is at variance with the all-union Constitution, while the all-union Constitution is at variance with the republic Constitution. However, there is no need to move so thoughtlessly toward confrontation with the all-union Constitution.

I propose a mechanism that would help in resolving these contradictions. The more so since this cannot be set aside; I mean work on articles 68 and 70, which discuss sovereignty. Incidentally, I have already talked about this at a previous meeting.

One deputy who spoke before me noted that we must adopt a declaration. I am not not sure that this should be done in the form of a declaration. The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet should adopt a resolution containing a proposal to establish relations between the Lithuanian SSR and the USSR on the basis of equality through a treaty that defines which matters the republic will transfer to all-union competence and which will remain within the republic's own competence.

If we move along the normal legal pathway, certain articles on sovereignty would have to be reviewed. Resolution of these issues must be entrusted to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, which will conclude such a treaty with the USSR and within whose framework those articles of the Constitution of our republic would operate.

Speech of Deputy Yu. Paletskis.

Esteemed deputies. Obviously our session is approaching its culmination, namely a vote on this very important question. As I understand it, there will now be a special debate afterward on whether or not to set up a commission to prepare a Lithuanian SSR Constitution and do further work on it, and an additional vote on some of the amendments to the Constitution now in force, emphasizing the sovereignty of the republic. This is a very sensitive matter. As I understood it from the statements by the jurists, this would be a purely symbolic gesture. Such a resolution could also be rejected both by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the USSR Supreme Soviet. It is in contradiction of our own alas! imperfect USSR Constitution now in force. And so, even though it is also symbolic testimony to our confidence and strength it does possess some basis for the future. As has already been stated here, the Estonians have felt that they are stronger, and perhaps we have also. But let us consider whether this really is our strength or mere euphoria. Without saying that I am for or against it, I appeal to each one of you to think seriously about this. In my opinion, the road to democracy and to sovereignty is very long, difficult and exhausting. It is the overcoming of great obstacles—negotiations, dealings with our neighbors—the Latvians, Belorussians and Estonians—and with our comrades in Moscow, not just one-sided gestures. If we want to achieve this cherished goal in one

leap—fine. But we must also consider that below there lies a chasm and if we do not leap right over it, things will be bad.

In recent days I have had occasion to talk with people from Moscow—politicians of Lithuanian origin, and Americans. I talked with comrades who had returned from Washington and New York. All the Americans are following events here with bated breath. Are you not in a hurry? they say. Are you not taking a leap in the dark? I do not want to be misunderstood when appealing for restraint from decisive steps. If we consider it well and decide that these steps are necessary then they must be done. But I emphasize: we must think about them.

More than 400 people have gathered here in this hall. Today has been the first time that there has not been a unanimous vote. Evidently the next session in this hall will be even more interesting. Perhaps I express a subjective opinion, but I have always been interested in seeing how Yustinas Martsinkavichyus votes. No great proof is needed here: Yu. Martsinkavichyus has always been, I would say, like a tuning fork that enables us to feel the soul of the people. Moreover, Yu. Martsinkavichyus has since 3 June this year been a politician and with each passing day becomes a greater politician. This is also important. I think that no one will suspect me of sycophancy, but how Algirdas Brazauskas votes is also important to me. Not only because he is first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee but also because this is a person who has now had an enormous burden laid on his shoulders. He returned yesterday from Moscow and therefore has a better feeling for the situation than anyone else. Professor V. Landsbergis called him a rock. I agree. But a few days ago we spoke at a meeting with "Sajudis" representatives, and they reported on the organization of actions aimed against amendments to the USSR Constitution. Evidently through these actions they want to help Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. But we must be well aware of whether this really is help or the opposite, to put it mildly. If we say that our Algirdas Brazauskas is a rock, then M.S. Gorbachev is also a rock. And we have no desire for these two rocks to crash together. All that we will get from this is sparks, but nothing more. And so, when I vote I will be watching both Yustinas Martsinkavichyus and Algirdas Brazauskas. But I shall vote according to my conscience, thinking about the future of Lithuania. I call on others to do the same.

Speech of Deputy A. Brazauskas.

Esteemed comrades and deputies and all here present. Evidently the time has come to pose one more question: are we responsible for our own future and for the fate of Lithuania and our own people, and the future of our youth? Are we responsible for our normal life? I can tell you the following: during the month that I have been first secretary I have been unable to feel that life in Lithuania is normal. I have been unable to do this for many reasons. The chief of them because of what we are talking

about today. We have forgotten about our basic social problems, with which we have been grappling for many years. Some things have been achieved, some things have been done, but much remains to be done. We have forgotten about our republic's problems and about the daily wishes and needs of the population. We have become conceited, put our heads up in the thick clouds, and have today isolated ourselves within the walls of this wonderful hall and are trying to reach a decision of historic importance. We have reached some very good decisions. Everyone was happy, everyone voted for them. But what is it that we are discussing today? We are saying that while themselves abandoning all democratic principles and themselves failing to observe them, they are lecturing the officials of Lithuania, saying that they must adhere to those principles. I think that we should all observe democracy and that we are all obligated to observe it. What I have in mind is the Constitution of Lithuania. It is an issue that is extraordinarily complex, extraordinarily broad, and unusually sensitive. We shall not resolve this issue in an hour or even a month even if the most elevated, the most noble and the most profound feelings are brought to bear. You are all perfectly well aware of this. Even though many of the deputies who have spoken have, as I understand it, been totally unaware of this or, I would say, have no sense of responsibility regarding it. This is one side of the coin. The other side is that we have resolutions to adopt today the "Sajudis" draft legislation that has been distributed here. What does this mean? The Estonians approved this kind of draft legislation and this kind of law 2 years ago. It has been proposed that the Estonians convene a new session and abolish that law. So why do we Lithuanians need a one-day law that passes like a moth? For we are busy people, each one of us, and we are responsible first and foremost for that sector of work and for those duties that we carry out in our main work, and also for our parliamentary duties as deputies. And I think that we should not lead our own people and our own nation into error. I am therefore asking you earnestly to take a serious and well-considered step. And the more responsible and thoughtful we are in taking these confident steps, the more, incomparably more, we shall achieve unless we leap too high and then fall too far. And it is easy to do this.

We boast about ourselves, and in fact we have achieved a great deal. When guests come here to Lithuania they all say that socialism can occur within the framework of our state and that in Lithuania this has been achieved. And I fully agree with this. This cannot be effaced or hidden, because it is there for all to see. I think that what is needed to further improve our life is to achieve the maximum specific results in the various spheres of our life: in the economy, the sociopolitical sphere and so forth. And this can be achieved by taking serious and well-considered steps. And I totally agree that, even though the rate of development in the country's sociopolitical life is rapid, it is not rapid enough. Today we have discussed certain proposed draft laws, and additions to the USSR Constitution. Here, obviously, people

are in a hurry: questions that have not been properly considered are being formulated and they are possibly not in the spirit of the times or of the resolutions of the 19th Party Conference, as we have today acknowledged in our decisions. The signs of haste are also to be seen here.

In 5 months we have changed everything in Lithuania. We have made historic decisions. So why do we want to do in 2 days what needs a year? It is essential to draw up this Constitution. You have expressed great trust in me and I am grateful to have been given the high honor of leading the parliamentary commission. But this an extraordinarily great responsibility and a burden of extraordinary honor. No matter how good a man's health and nervous system the question is unusually complex, and I appeal to all deputies and inhabitants of Lithuania to consider well whether we should hurry with this Constitution. I understand that we shall work on it in this commission if so decided. And after the various sections have been set up we shall discuss with great seriousness all the issues in the individual chapters and track the course of events so as to improve the country's Constitution. We must not forget this, and we must listen carefully and take counsel. Now we have forged ahead. This, of course, is greatly to our credit. No republic has yet prepared a draft Constitution to the extent that we have. This is very good.

I think that at the same time we must consult with other republics, primarily our neighbors, about how they are preparing a constitution and what its particular articles will be. Meanwhile, there is a whole series of articles that requires majority discussion, close approximation with the reality, and an understanding of republic sovereignty in the political and economic life of the country. I therefore propose the following to deputies: adopt this draft of the resolution. If the members of the commission have additions, they can be added. We shall include in this work not only the deputies but also other experts and representatives of the "Sajudis" and "Unity" and other public organizations, and we shall continue this work through joint efforts. This, dear comrades, is my proposal: be reconciled with this thought, and we shall consider it well and think out each step that we take in this present, very crucial life, and do everything possible to live normally, work normally, and resolve the questions that are being raised with increasing acuteness in our daily life.

Thank you, comrades.

L. Shepetis, who chaired the third meeting of the 10th Session of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet 11th Convocation, reported on the transfer to procedural matters.

L. Shepetis: Let us move on to the vote. There is a proposal to vote. You have been given the draft resolution and you have heard the concluding statement by comrade Brazauskas. Are there any questions? I ask it now (Someone says something from his seat; it is not heard). What do you personally propose? Comrade Guretskas, write it all down. Budrikis, Romualdas, Sikorskis and Morkinas? Are there any other proposals? Those in favor of adopting the draft resolution on the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR presented to you along with the proposals introduced here and personally for setting up a commission. Please raise your hands. Thank you. Against? Abstaining? None. The draft resolution is adopted unanimously. So, comrades, is there any need to vote on other partial proposals?

Voices from the hall: no.

Shepetis: (again) There is no need to vote?

Voices from the hall: no, there is no need.

Shepetis: No. Thank you.

Voices from the hall: Call a recess.

Shepetis: Of course we must have a recess. I beg your pardon, I am hearing different opinions. Should we continue? There will be requests. It will take half an hour. Shall we continue? Let us continue.

Let us begin by discussing item seven on the agenda: confirmation of ukazes of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Comrade Guretskas will read the report. We ask you not to speak for too long.

Y. Guretskas: (reads the report).

LiSSR Supsov Secretary's Speech on Draft USSR Constitution Laws

*18000332a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
20 Nov 88 p 2*

[Report by Y. Guretskas, secretary of the Presidium of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet "On the Draft Law of the USSR 'On Amendments and Addenda to the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR' and 'On Elections of People's Deputies of the USSR'"]

[Text] Respected comrades: Recent months and days have been extraordinarily important to the life of both the nation as a whole and our republic. They were significant in the life of each citizen, of each of us. The 19th All-Union party conference was greeted with great enthusiasm. Its resolutions on the democratization of the Soviet society and reform of the political system, on international relations, glasnost and legal reform were greeted with complete and universal approval. Great hopes are pinned on the future legislative acts, which are to legally confirm the irreversibility of the restructuring process, establish a legal state, enlarge the political rights

and liberties of the citizens, and develop the independence of the Union republics. It is therefore not surprising that the draft laws of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics "On Amendments and Addenda to the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR" and "On Elections of People's Deputies of the USSR," published for national discussion, evoked, as nothing before, enormous universal interest and vigorous debate.

It is doubtful that the activeness and concern of the citizens, the labor collectives and public organizations with problems of political life have ever before been manifested so markedly. Everyone today is interested in them. Everyone is expressing his opinion: the old and the young, the worker and the kolkhoz worker, the scientist and the white-collar worker, people of all nationalities, of all segments of the society. There are meetings and assemblies just about every day. Republic residents are discussing and assessing the aforementioned draft laws of the USSR. More than 2,000 various proposals have already been sent to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. People are voicing approval of those provisions in the laws which delineate legislative and executive powers, establish priority of elected over executive bodies, form a qualitatively new and higher agency of state authority for the nation, establish a socialist legal state, and so forth.

It should be pointed out, however, that an absolute majority of republic residents do not approve of a number of clauses in the draft laws and demand a fundamental rewording. Around 1.8 million of the republic's residents indicated their opposition to these provisions with their signatures. As we know, the signatures are being collected at the initiative of the Lithuanian Movement for Restructuring.

Many provisions in the draft laws on amendments and addenda to the nation's Constitution and elections of people's deputies do indeed not conform to the spirit of the resolution passed at the 19th All-Union party conference or the restructuring. It is not difficult to detect in some of them relics of the system of administration by orders and decrees, which has been condemned by the party and the society.

In the first place, there is no support for the concept of those who prepared the drafts which would continue to limit the independence of the Union republics. This is particularly clearly demonstrated by those provisions in the Fundamental Law of the USSR which have to do with abolishing acts passed by the highest agencies of state authority and management of the Union republics.

Nor can one agree with the proposed improvement for protecting the interests of the Union of SSRs, which do not consider the prerogatives of members of the Federation—that is, of the Union republics, which, incidentally, are

constantly violated or ignored by Union departments at various levels.

One more thing. The procedure for forming the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its status as presented in the draft are also contrary to the interests of the Union republics, as well as the further democratization of state life.

It would hardly serve any purpose to comment in detail on each article in the amendments and addenda to the Constitution of the USSR. This would take up too much of our so-valuable time. I think it should just be pointed out that the drafts were prepared without thinking them through and that the Leninist principles for establishing and organizing the Soviet Federation were forgotten in some cases. These are the principles which must serve as our guide in the further development and strengthening of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, an allied, multinational state.

This is why we cannot be satisfied with the proposed draft laws.

We need to be guided by political, realistic and common sense, however. We do not want to hamper the development of the restructuring process by presenting the draft decree of the republic's Supreme Soviet on the draft legislative acts of the USSR. Because of this, we are proposing not the protesting of those documents as a whole, because this will result in an impasse (the former were not suitable, and the new ones are not acceptable), but speaking out to have the approaching, special session of the USSR Supreme Soviet discuss only those provisions in the draft on amendments and addenda to the Constitution of the USSR which pertain to the organization of elections of people's deputies of the USSR and the composition of the higher agencies of state authority of the USSR. We also want to reject the provision that a third of the people's deputies be elected from public organizations. We want to demand that the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet be elected from among the people's deputies of the USSR residing and working in the corresponding Union republics, according to a unified quota and on a party basis. We believe that the newly elected highest agency of state authority of the USSR should devote particular attention to a complete and definitive reform of the provisions in the present Constitution of the USSR. This work should be performed in tandem with the preparation of new editions of the constitutions of the Union republics, and taking them into account. Naturally, this work must be performed by a commission consisting of competent representatives of all the Union republics. It is very important for this work to be performed with publicity.

It is on the basis of this platform, respected deputies, that we submit for your discussion this draft decree of the republic's Supreme Soviet.

LiSSR Supsov Resolution on Draft USSR Constitution Laws

*18000332b Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
20 Nov 88 p 2*

[Resolution of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet "On the Draft Laws of the USSR 'On Amendments and Addenda to the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR' and 'On Elections of People's Deputies of the USSR'"]

[Text] The draft laws of the the USSR "On Amendments and Addenda to the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR" and "On Elections of People's Deputies of the USSR" are being actively discussed in the republic. The citizens are voicing their assessments and proposals at meetings and rallies of labor collectives and the population at large, as well as in their resolutions and through the mass media. The electors are expressing their opinion also to the deputies of the supreme soviets of the USSR and the LiSSR and to the local soviets of people's deputies. The Presidium of the republic's Supreme Soviet alone has received more than 2,000 proposals.

Expressing their support for the resolutions coming out of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, the citizens of Soviet Lithuania approve those provisions in the draft laws which are designed to democratize the process of electing the highest agencies of state authority and to reconstitute the membership of representative state agencies of the USSR.

With respect to this, the republic's Supreme Soviet, reflecting the will of the population, the labor collectives and public organizations, expresses its disagreement with those provisions in the draft laws which are in conflict with the decrees and the purport of the 19th All-Union party conference and are designed to increase centralization, limit the sovereignty of the republic and downgrade the Leninist principles underlying the Federation.

This opinion has been indicated with almost 1.8 million signatures of republic residents who are in disagreement with these drafts.

Having discussed the drafts of these laws, the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic decrees:

1) that at this stage in the reform of the nation's political system it be limited to a democratic reform of the system of higher agencies of state authority of the USSR conforming to the demands set forth at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference; in keeping with this, that the forthcoming, special session of the USSR Supreme Soviet not consider the proposed edition of the Law on Amendments and Addenda to the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR and the Law on Elections of People's Deputies of the USSR, but that it consider only such

amendments and addenda to the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR as pertain to the organization of elections of people's deputies of the USSR and the composition of higher agencies of state authority of the USSR, after defining their temporary validity; that it reject in the process the election of one third of the people's deputies of the USSR from public organizations; that it establish the election of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet from the people's deputies of the USSR working or residing in the corresponding Union republics, according to a single quota and on a party basis;

1) that a temporary Law on Elections of People's Deputies of the USSR be worked out and ratified;

3) that the work of preparing the drafts of other amendments and addenda to the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR be organized in such a way that it is carried out only after new editions of the constitutions of the Union republics have been prepared and ratified, and that they be taken into account;

4) that a commission be established from among the representatives of all the Union republics to prepare the amendments and addenda to the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR.—V. Astrauskas, Chairman of the Presidium of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, and Y. Guretskas, Secretary of the Presidium of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet (Vilnius, 18 November 1988)

LiSSR Supsov Deputies Discuss Draft USSR Constitution Laws

*18000332c Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
26 Nov 88 pp 2-3*

[Report under the rubric "The 10th Session of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, 11th convocation": "Debate on the Report on the Draft Laws of the USSR 'On Amendments and Addenda to the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR' and 'On Elections of People's Deputies of the USSR'"]

[Text]

Speech by Deputy V. Statulyavichyus

The draft Law on Amendments and Addenda to the Constitution of the USSR and Law on Elections of People's Deputies of the USSR designed to expand democracy and self-government and to improve the electoral system, submitted by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Supreme Soviet, are being discussed in Latvia and throughout the nation.

During the recent discussion on society and the state in the Academy of Sciences, the participants recalled Marx' words to the effect that when relations between the

society and the state are good, the society is almost unaware of the state. The state, like a night guard, protects the society.

In our nation's history the state has done a lot of good for the society, but there have also been many tragic developments, which we are presently discussing. The state became undemocratic and lawless. The social sciences, expected to see to it that relations between the society and the state are honest and just, were also degraded through the state's efforts. We are therefore convinced that the society must be protected with more than just pretty words and promises. This has to be done by a proper Constitution, by soviets elected on a direct, universal and democratic basis and by seeing to it that the Constitution is implemented.

Unfortunately, because of the proposed draft amendments and addenda to the Constitution I will boldly say that both days and nights have become troubled for many of us. A statement by the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences, published in TIESA, states the following: "Under the present Constitution of the USSR the RSFSR alone has several times greater legislative power than all the other republics put together. The draft laws under discussion increase this inequality even more. Furthermore, the agency of power, set up on an unequal basis, is granted unlimited power to regulate the economic, social, cultural and other activities of the republics: the sovereignty of the republics is not restored, but is totally eliminated." What this means for the nation was graphically demonstrated at a meeting with Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU CC N.N. Slyunkov during a discussion of issues pertaining to scientific and technological progress. All of the speakers—plant directors and representatives of scientific institutes and higher educational institutions—underscored the fact that they could do far more if their hands were not tied by orders from the center, that the branch ministries, which have become huge monopolies, not only do not know how, but frequently do not even try, to strive to see that their products measure up to world standards. If the republics were permitted to live their own way and not according to a single pattern, we would immediately have 15 experiments.

Speaking for the deputy group which includes USSR Supreme Soviet Deputy Ionas Kublyus, Konstantinas Bogdanas, Algis Chuplinskas, Yustinas Martsinkavichyus, Yuras Pozhela, Anatoliyus Rasteyka, Algirdas Zhukauskas and myself, I therefore propose the following resolution of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet:

The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet resolves to propose to the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

1) that in the current phase of the restructuring of the nation's political system the work be restricted to reforming the system of higher state agencies of the

USSR to bring it into conformity with the demands set forth at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference;

2) that a new, temporary law on elections of people's deputies of the USSR be prepared and ratified, which would secure for all the citizens truly equal participation in the elections, equal weight for their votes, and equal representation of the Union republics in the legislative agencies of the USSR, particularly the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet;

3) that the constitutions of the Union republics be prepared and ratified prior to ratification of the Constitution of the USSR;

4) we consider it expedient to make the chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet the chairman of the commission for preparing the draft Constitution of the USSR, and it should be composed of authorized individuals from the Union republic supreme soviets, representing the Union republics on an equal basis;

5) that if there prove to be several versions of the draft Constitution or of its articles in the process of the national discussion of the draft Constitution, the best be selected through a referendum, taking into consideration the voting by republic.

We also approve the draft decree on the new Constitution of the LiSSR. The draft Constitution has already been discussed at a session of the LiSSR Academy of Sciences, in the Sejm of the Movement for the Restructuring and in the commission of LiSSR Supreme Soviet, and it could be rapidly submitted to the public. We are concerned about the fate of the Constitution, however, particularly if, despite our protestations and the protestations of republic residents, Article 108 of the laws being considered is approved at the forthcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It states that a congress of people's deputies of the USSR has the right to repeal legislative acts passed by the highest agencies of state authority in the republics if they do not conform to the Constitution of the USSR. Since the congress passes laws and decrees by a majority vote, these could be repealed. A republic will be represented by only a few deputies, after all, and all the more since many articles in our future Constitution do not coincide with provisions in the present Constitution of the USSR.

Paragraph 7 of the draft decree submitted to the deputies proposes that the USSR Supreme Soviet define another system for discussing laws of the USSR when any Union republic objects to the draft laws in the person of its highest agencies of authority. This is a good thing, but it seems to us that the main element in relations between the republic and the USSR should be the provisions in our future Constitution stating that relations between the Lithuanian SSR and the USSR be based on an agreement specifying which questions the republic delegates to Union authority, and in other matters only the laws of the USSR would be in effect in the republic. In

our opinion, this approach by the Supreme Soviet should be reflected in the decree today so that the forthcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will be aware of this.

Speech by Deputy R. Blyudzhys

A meeting of the electors of the city of Klaypeda and deputies of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet was held on 14 November 1988. Participants in the meeting represented more than 17,000 electors. We discussed the draft Constitution of the LiSSR. All ten deputies of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet who participated in the meeting approved the adoption of the new Constitution of the LiSSR. At the same time, they indicated that the draft Law on Amendments and Addenda to the Constitution of the USSR and Law on Elections of People's Deputies of the USSR are antidemocratic and contrary to resolutions passed at the 19th All-Union party conference. The rights of the Union republics would be totally limited with the adoption of these amendments and addenda to the Constitution of the USSR. This is why it is essential to ratify the new Constitution of the LiSSR at this session, the draft of which was prepared in the spirit of resolutions passed at the 19th All-Union party conference and conform to the concept of a legal state formulated by the party and to the will and aspirations of all the residents of Lithuania.

I propose that we place discussion of the draft new Constitution of the LiSSR on the agenda.

I appeal to all deputies of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet to vote unanimously for the adoption of the Constitution of the LiSSR. It has been approved by all the residents of Lithuania, whose will was expressed by participants in the 1st session of the Sejm of the Lithuanian Movement for the Restructuring, who analyzed the draft Constitution of the LiSSR in detail.

The group of deputies in the LiSSR Supreme Soviet from Klaypeda, empowered by the electors, ask all the deputies present at this session to support my proposals.

Speech by Deputy Yu. Yarashunas

We farmers believe that it is our main duty to make correct use of the land and raise adequate grain so that there is enough for our people, so that there will be more meat and milk, so that the people can be full and have abundant food on their table. Farmers possible have less to do with political issues, since our direct duty is one of raising grain. When such important matters are being discussed, however, we too do not remain on the sideline, but take a fairly active part in the discussion of all republic issues. In my opinion, a competent commission has been set up to prepare the draft Constitution. I believe that it will prepare a draft and submit it to the public for discussion. With respect to the Constitution of the USSR, we have discussed it and believe that the draft Constitution of the USSR has been unsatisfactorily prepared and does not meet the demands set forth at the

19th All-Union conference, and we ask the USSR Supreme Soviet to set up a commission made up of representatives of all the Union republics to prepare amendments and addenda to the Constitution and to submit them for national discussion.

Speech by Deputy V. Kubilyus

Right now, at this moment in time, two issues are interwoven: we are discussing the drafts of amendments and addenda to the Constitution of the USSR as well as the Constitution of the LiSSR. Day before yesterday, following fairly heated debate in the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, we decided to include these issues on the agenda for the session.

With respect to the amendments and addenda to the Constitution of the USSR, I want not only to express my opinion, but also to announce the unanimous decision of a rayon party conference held last Friday, which we reported by telegram to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It states that the draft Law on Amendments and Addenda to the Constitution of the USSR and Law on the Election of People's Deputies of the USSR do not conform to resolutions passed at the 19th party conference, and it is therefore proposed that the discussion be postponed. Today, however, when the work of the deputies is coming to an end and elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet are approaching, it would obviously not be logical completely to postpone discussion of the draft at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I therefore support the statement presented here by Comrade Guretskas on the changes, and that presented by Comrade Statulyavichyus on the amendments.

But I also have another feeling today. And I am not by myself. All of us have recently been very fervently discussing the matter of whether we are demanding too much.

The further we go, however, the more convinced we become that we are not demanding too much, but only as much as was proclaimed at the 19th All-Union party conference. There is another side to the question, however: are we not in too great a hurry, and have we prepared well for making these demands? I would therefore say that I support with all my heart and mind the proposal which emerged yesterday on changes in individual paragraphs in the Constitution of the LiSSR, changes which, incidentally, are very proper. Furthermore, these changes have been included in the draft new Constitution. I would suggest deciding these matters in a comprehensive manner, however, without singling out individual articles of the Constitution, democratically, after receiving the people's approval. This very thing has been specified in a program of economic independence for the republic, which has now been prepared and is being very vigorously discussed and will have to be assessed and approved by the Supreme Soviet of Soviet Latvia. Incidentally, this program is the crucial factor in the writing of the republic's Constitution.

Speech by Deputy V. Povilauskas

We truly live in a very important period, full of all sorts of social and political events. And the extensive discussion presently underway in all segments of the society on the amendments and addenda to the Constitution of the USSR, as well as on the elections of people's deputies of the USSR, is truly raising a great deal of concern.

I am not a legal expert and I cannot analyze all of the articles and clauses with much competence. When one reads them, however, one sees that, as been stressed here, they contain things clearly in conflict with the resolutions passed at the 19th All-Union party conference. I want to say that the electors of my electoral district and all of the rayon residents, together with other people in the republic, are expressing a great deal of concern with their signatures and making suggestions that the amendments and addenda to the Constitution of the USSR not be discussed at the eminent session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Today, however, following the report by Comrade Y. Guretskas and the speeches of certain deputies, it appears that it would not be expedient completely to postpone discussion of all the provisions. I therefore want to voice my agreement with what has been said here by Academician V. Statulyavichyus and Comrade V. Kubilyus of Kretinga, and say that the deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet who have taken part in this session have listened well to the comments and proposals of the deputies of the republic's Supreme Soviet so that they can go to Moscow and express the aspirations of Lithuania's residents at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

With respect to Lithuania's Constitution, I read the proposed draft just yesterday. As far as I can see, it corresponds to the aspirations of our entire society. This draft can and should be approved. At the same time, however, it seems to me that the decision submitted today for discussion—to set up an empowered commission of republic deputies, headed by Comrade A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party CC, to carefully and thoroughly study the draft Constitution once more—is the most reasonable decision at the present stage. And, as Comrade V. Statulyavichyus proposed, we should not postpone the discussion for a long time but should acquaint the public with the draft Constitution as soon as possible.

Speech by Lawyer K. Moteka, Guest at the Session

The hour has come when you must discuss and decide whether the draft laws On Amendments and Addenda to the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR and On Elections of People's Deputies of the USSR are acceptable for our republic. I call upon you not to be taken in by the captivating, fine-sounding words in the Preamble to the draft Constitution of the USSR, which would make it appear that the law is an attempt to expand socialist democracy and self-government of the people and improves the electoral system, the structure

and the functioning of the soviets of people's deputies and the justice agencies. One does not have to study these draft laws too thoroughly in order to see that the clauses contained in the amendments and addenda to the Constitution with respect to the declared sovereignty of the Union republics continue to conceal its reality. From the day Soviet power was established up to the present, 18 November, Latvia has not had and does not have either the sovereignty proclaimed in the Constitution or the statehood. Therefore, today, when documents from the 19th All-Union CPSU Congress of 28 June-1 July 1988, which maintained that the reform of the political system is the main issue of the many difficult issues facing the Soviet Union, have been proclaimed to the entire world, in light of this an objective discussion of the published drafts and their assessment are of fundamental political importance. Resolutions passed at the conference state unequivocally that the reforms would have been carried out in a far better manner if conservatism were not so tenacious in the administrative system and if the methods of administration by orders and decrees had not retained such a solid hold. The attempt to plan and control all areas of life in a petty, centralized manner, as Comrade M.S. Gorbachev has stated, has tied the society's hands and have been a great impediment to the exercise of initiative by people, public organizations and collectives. The stagnant system of Union authorities and its structure of methods based on commands and pressure are today preventing us from resolving basic problems in the restructuring and implementing the concept of economic independence for Latvia a concept worked out by the brightest minds of our republic, thoroughly calculated and solidly validated. Documents of the 19th All-Union conference state that primarily the following real conditions must be established for proper management of the nation's affairs:

- 1) The election system must be changed.
- 2) The structure of agencies of power and management must be reorganized.
- 3) The laws must be reformed.

This is the key given to the restructuring by the 19th All-Union conference, and you deputies are obligated today to open the door for Lithuania to achieve genuine sovereignty.

Do the published draft laws conform to the principles of a legal state in the spirit of the 19th party conference? No, they do not, because they restrict the rights of the Union republics and peoples even more than before and reinforce the centralized structure of administration by orders, decrees and pressure more than before. While the present Constitution of the USSR defines the entire group of social and economic and other issues removed from the jurisdiction of the Union republics in 12 paragraphs in Article 73, the draft amendments and addenda list these and other matters removed from the

jurisdiction of the Union republics in 21 paragraphs in Article 113. We should also look at the content of the 21 paragraphs in this article, which states that the Supreme Soviet of the USSR decides also on other (that is, all) issues placed under the authority of the Union of SSRs, except those which are placed under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR. Although Article 137 of the draft specifies that the Congress of People's Deputies of a Union republic, as the republic's highest agency of state authority, has the right to decide on all matters included in the jurisdiction of the Union republic by the Constitution of the USSR and the constitution of the Union republic, it follows from the limitations indicated below that the new Constitution provides for no sovereign rights for the Union republic at all. But according to Article 113 of the draft and other provisions of the draft, only the Supreme Soviet of the USSR establishes the basic laws of the Union republics, regulates property relations, the organization of economic management, social and cultural development, the budget and finance system, wages and pricing, and the exercise of the rights, liberties and duties of citizens, establishes the general principles governing the functioning of republic and local agencies of state authority and management, establishes even the legal status of public organizations, reviews the most important questions of national and international relations, analyzes questions of national culture and national indoctrination and the national equality of nations, ethnic groups and national groups, the securing of [their] interests in accordance with the overall interests and requirements of the state, and so forth. In addition, it is the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and not the Union republic, as specified in Article 119, which declares a state of war or an emergency situation in individual localities, even introduces special forms of administration when necessary, and so forth, and so on.

Article 125 of the draft Constitution establishes a new agency: the Committee for Constitutional Oversight of the USSR. This is a new agency of commands and pressure. It is vested with authority to monitor the conformity of laws and decrees of the USSR Council of Ministers and the constitutions and other laws of the Union republics to the Constitution. In addition, it legalizes the following: if the Committee for Constitutional Oversight sends its own conclusion to an agency which has issued an act, the very fact that such a conclusion has been sent halts the execution of the act or individual provisions in the act.

And so, from the point of view of the amendments and addenda to the Constitution of the USSR, just what can Lithuania, now called a sovereign Union state, do? Its rights are listed in Article 137 of the draft. According to the permission provided in this article the Union republic adopts and amends its own Constitution.

You will show us today, respected deputies of Lithuania, whether it will be difficult or easy to do. The Union republic also elects the supreme soviet of the Union

republic, its chairman and other agencies and officials accountable to a congress, makes decisions with respect to holding referendums and establishes long-range state plans and the most important programs for the republic's economic and social development. But bearing in mind that the long-range state plans of the USSR and the most important All-Union plans for economic and social development are mandatory for the republics, the Union republic can only approve that which is planned at the All-Union levels. It was with good reason we were reminded yesterday by one of the deputies that the farmers of our Lithuania produce twelve times as much meat as is left for them, while at the same time our republic's government fights in Moscow for some reduction in the meat delivery plans so that people in the republic can buy more of it.

Therefore, there can be no doubt that an attempt is presently being made with the amendments and addenda to the Constitution of the USSR to legalize the complete inequality of the Union republic.

They are trying to convince us today that the proposed amendments and addenda to the Constitution pertain only to that part which begins with Article 89 and that the other articles—that is, from 1 to 88 inclusive—and that the other articles will be discussed, amended or supplemented later, including the aforementioned Article 73. But what will be left of Article 73 if Article 113 is ratified? Will it be possible to supplement or change or even to discuss [matters] if, according to the draft, its provisions are transferred to Article 113, and only the meaningless number remains of Article 73.

One other evil is encountered in the draft Constitution with respect to the establishment of a legal state. It has to do with the new procedure submitted to us for electing judges. In the resolution of the 19th All-Union conference "On the Legal Reform," we read in Paragraph 4 the following point: "We need to increase the prestige of the court, to ensure the absolute independence of judges and their subordination only to the law, and to define specific measures of liability for interfering in their work and for disrespect of a judge. One of the guarantees of greater independence for the judges should be the election of rayon, city, okrug, oblast and kray courts by the higher soviets of people's deputies, as well as the establishment of a longer term in office for them."

And what do the draft amendments and addenda to the Constitution offer us? Article 152 states that people's judges of rayon (city) people's courts are elected by the corresponding rayon and city rayon soviets of people's deputies, that kray, oblast, city and okrug judges are elected by the corresponding soviets of people's deputies, that the judges are accountable to the soviets of people's deputies which elected them, report to them and can be recalled by them by the established procedure.

What is this, a deliberate and calculated departure from resolutions of the 19th conference? Is it an error or a

calculated attack by bureaucrats from the times of stagnation and enemies of the restructuring on the legal state being formed? Another question also comes up: Why, following publication of the drafts of the above-mentioned laws, was the public not told the motives under the cover of which there was a departure from resolutions of the 19th party conference? I offer and ask for support of the respected deputies, ask you to unanimously join in the appeal by millions of people in Lithuania's community to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, which demands that the draft amendments and addenda to the Constitution of the USSR not be discussed at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. And to ask the USSR Supreme Soviet publicly to name the authors of these draft laws and demand from them an explanation as to why, when they worked out the draft laws, they so grossly departed from resolutions passed at the 19th conference and from its spirit. I also ask you to appeal for new drafts of these laws to be written by a commission of representatives of all the Union republics, participating on a party basis, after all of the Union republics have ratified their constitutions.

The discussion of Lithuania's Constitution is inseparably linked to discussion of the draft amendments and addenda to the Constitution of the USSR. Let us be far-sighted, focused and resolute. I call upon you to take advantage of the constitutional right vested in you to make these amendments, with which you are familiar, in the Constitution of the LiSSR.

Speech by Deputy Yu. Pozhela

Today we are discussing a matter which is very important for the life of our republic, as it is for the other Union republics and the nation as a whole. We can see from our experience, after all, that the restructuring is not proceeding in the same way [everywhere], but is lagging far behind in some places. The process of democratizing our central authority is also way behind. The bureaucratic apparatus still functions. We still have to coordinate the matter with the apparatus when we want to expand research in the area of culture, let us say, or studies in other areas. We are forced to ask for money from someone, and we have to ask how we can best live our lives.

A situation has developed in which it is very difficult to replace the central leadership. Bureaucratic centralism is still alive in the Soviet government and in the party. It is therefore a very important matter to pass the first law, to take the first step, leading to consolidation of the democratization, to a process of democratization in our administrative agencies.

It is a good thing that a parliamentary system will be established by adopting the decrees under discussion. The members will gather not just for a single day; a permanent parliament works for months on end. There should also be approval for the democratic elections of deputies. Revolutionary processes are underway, and

national questions are being raised throughout the nation. Incidentally, the "national question" is a very strange term. The resolution of the national question, however, in fact involves the national sovereignty of all the republics. If this movement has already gathered force in our republic—we have Sayudis—and there is another in Estonia, it is likely that in the near future the same thing will occur in all the republics of the USSR, including the RSFSR. After all, the culture and the economic development of all the republics, including the enormous Russian Federation, have suffered from centralized control.

We must rid ourselves of the dictate of central establishments. We must speak out very resolutely on this matter. Our state must be a state of sovereign republics. Some scholars maintain that the sovereign republics could form not a union and not a federation, but a confederation. But that seems very strange to me. The very word "republic" indicates sovereignty, after all. There is no other definition. When we speak of the sovereignty of our state, we must proclaim it clearly and precisely, for the draft decree contains paragraphs which "suppress" the sovereignty and the demonstration of initiative by Lithuania and all of the republics as a whole. These are articles 89, 113, 111 and 108. The previously defined provision for elections should also be revised.

I would recommend that the democratization process not be postponed, because otherwise we will be unable to neutralize unacceptable instructions from higher authorities. Speakers K. Moteka, V. Statulyavichyus and others who spoke before me expressed this very well.

The main focuses should be fixed in the constitutions of the Lithuanian SSR and the USSR. It seems to me that the following proposal should be proclaimed or set down in the decree: The Supreme Soviet of the LiSSR declares that relations between the LiSSR and the USSR are established by treaty on a basis of equality. It would indicate what issues the republic delegates to Union jurisdiction. It should be clearly stated that we are eliminating the provisions which permit the central Union authorities to give orders to the republic. For our part, we should suggest how the republic will interact with the USSR. It seems to me that these relations should reflect a treaty to be concluded between the supreme soviets of the LiSSR and the USSR. The Estonians have proposed something of the sort, it seems.

Such a treaty should indicate what issues we delegate to the Union: defense, foreign or some other affairs. These objectives need to be clearly set forth, in legal terms. We shall unquestionably remain part of the USSR. Otherwise, we will have destroyed the alliance of peoples presently in existence and the concept of humane socialism being implemented in the nation.

I repeat, we must precisely define relations between the USSR and the republic, to be regulated by treaty between the presidiums of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet and the

USSR Supreme Soviet. Incidentally, different treaties could be in effect for different republics. All other issues would be decided by the laws of the Lithuanian SSR, as set forth in the Constitution: laws of the Lithuanian SSR are in effect within the Lithuanian SSR. Consequently, those laws which we "are not relinquishing" to the USSR should be valid for local authorities.

Now, a few words about the republic's Constitution. All of our demands would have been far more precisely defined if we had adopted and ratified our Constitution somewhat earlier. We cannot adopt it yet, although people from the Academy of Sciences of the LiSSR have long been at work on the draft document and have analyzed many issues. It is clear that we will not adopt a constitution prior to the elections in March. We could do much more during that time, however. In my opinion, the time proposed for discussion the draft, in January or February, is too late. The discussion will coincide with another important event in the Soviet Union, the elections. It seems to me that we could begin the process at least a month earlier.

Speech by Deputy Y. Misyunas

The establishment of a legal state is our goal. This noble task was advanced at the 19th party conference, the decrees of which also defined the typical features of a legal state. One of them is that the law dominates in all areas of state and public life. A reliable and smoothly structured system of laws must be created in order to achieve this, however. This is a long and complex process. The Constitution, the law of laws, occupies a special place in this system. It must establish the legal bases for the existence of the state, a federation, and its subjects, the Union republics.

The draft Law on Amendments and Addenda to the Constitution of the USSR and Law on Elections of People's Deputies of the USSR, submitted for general discussion, represent the first important step in the process of establishing a legal state. It has become clear, however, that millions of people, including specialists in the law, cannot understand these drafts. This demonstrates their unsuitability.

Both drafts have been thoroughly discussed in the republic's Supreme Court. The general conclusion is that the proposed election reform is even less democratic than the procedure currently in effect, that the planned procedure for electoral representation restricts the free development and equality of the Union republics. Explanation from high party and Soviet levels that this reform will only help to shape institutions at the highest level of state authority are unconvincing. It seems to me we do not want to face the fact that it defines also the authority of that level, which leaves no room for sovereignty for the Union republics, strengthens the bureaucratic system of management and relies on the methods of administration by orders and decrees typical of a unitary state, which have already been condemned.

It was announced that, in addition to the aforementioned items, questions pertaining to improvement of the structure and the functioning of the courts will also be discussed. These are also very important legal acts, which the public must know about and express its opinion on.

But comrades deputies, who among us knows just what draft laws will be discussed? Why have they not been made public? In this case glasnost has apparently gotten ahead of preparation of the laws.

One can only assume that the draft Law on the Judicial System of the USSR and the Union Republics and Law on the Status of the Judge in the USSR will be submitted for discussion. A comparison of these with resolutions passed at the 19th party conference also raises numerous questions.

We all acknowledge the fact that a legal state must have an authoritative and independent court. Otherwise, it will not ensure socialist legality. This is precisely why resolutions passed at the 19th party conference state that judges are elected at sessions of the higher soviet of people's deputies (the Supreme Soviet in Latvia's situation). However, amendments to the Constitution state that people's judges are elected by the soviet of people's deputies of the respective organ (city). Independence of judges from local authorities is out of the question in this case. This means that there will be deviations from and distortions of legality, and gross errors. According to the draft Law on the Status of the Judge in the USSR, judges are elected by the higher soviet of people's deputies.

And so, we have two drafts, two difference provisions. This small detail shows how imperfect the system for preparing draft laws is.

Another thing: the independence of a state's jurisdiction is a sign of its sovereignty. What is outlined in the draft laws? Under the Law on the Judicial System the judges of Union republics, including the supreme court, are subordinate to an extra-constitutional Union organ, the Ministry of Justice of the USSR. It follows that they want to leave the administration of the law centralized, even though the recent past has demonstrated that this kind of centralization and its basis of orders and decrees are not effective. It is not characteristic of a legal state—neither for a federated state nor for the sovereignty of Union republics.

And so, in the legal respect the draft laws submitted for discussion do not conform to the concepts of the restructuring and democratization set forth at the 19th party conference. They are unacceptable. It is asserted that if these laws are not accepted, the restructuring process will merely spin its wheels. It seems to me that it is spinning its wheels right now in the legislative process, since it is necessary to protect the yet unborn legal state.

Expressing my own opinion and fulfilling the mandates of the electors, residents of the city of Klaypeda, I declare that we do not approve the published drafts. They can be discussed only following fundamental revision, with the participation of representatives of the Union republics. Since there is very little time remaining and it would be impossible to prepare new draft laws, the drafts prepared should not be discussed at this session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Speech by Deputy A. Zhukauskas

The 19th All-Union party conference gave powerful impetus to the restructuring and democratization. Democratization still has to be learned, however, both at the upper levels of power and by all citizens and the youth and in the functioning of sessions of the Supreme Soviet. And feverish haste, any matters not analyzed very thoroughly or objectively, and any attempts to impose the opinion of a minority upon the majority, or vice versa, that of the majority upon a minority, are one manifestation of antidemocratism.

The draft Law on Amendments and Addenda to the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR was also prepared hastily. It constricts the rights of the republics to the utmost and specifies an undemocratic system for making up the USSR Supreme Soviet. A good deal of work still needs to be done on the Constitution of the USSR. A good home should always be built in toto, and not piece-meal. One cannot live in a home without a roof or windows. By the same token, the Constitution of the USSR must be written as a whole and not in parts, as is presently

proposed. I therefore feel that the following points should be clearly reflected in the decrees we adopt:

1) The Amendments and addenda to the Constitution of the USSR should not be discussed at the forthcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It would be possible right now to pass a truly democratic law on elections, under which all Union republics would have the same number of deputies in the Council of Nationalities.

2) A competent commission should be set up for preparing a new draft Constitution of the USSR, in which all of the Union republics would be equally represented.

3) The Constitution should be based on Union republic constitutions newly prepared and adopted by the established procedure. The first draft Constitution of the USSR should be submitted for detailed and universal discussion, and the final draft should be adopted only after a referendum is held on the new Constitution as a whole, and separately for the editions of certain controversial provisions. All citizens with the right to vote should participate in the referendum. The results of the referendum should be summed up and announced for the separate republics.

I shall not discuss another point on the agenda. I believe, however, that the same democratic principles should be adhered to in the preparation and ratification of the Constitution of Soviet Lithuania. It should be published in the press and thoroughly discussed, and, to make it more difficult to alter the Constitution in the future, it should also be approved by a referendum, with all the republic's residents voting.

NTIS

ATTN: PROCESS 103

BEVERLY FARRADAY

5285 PORT ROYAL RD

SPRINGFIELD, VA

22161

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.